



THE
British Critic,
QUARTERLY THEOLOGICAL REVIEW,
AND
ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

No. I.—JAN. 1827.

XXIII C. 1

ADVERTISEMENTS.

QUARTERLY
THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

***MESSRS. RIVINGTON** respectfully inform the Subscribers to this Work that it has been thought advisable to unite it with the **BRITISH CRITIC**. The Plan on which the Quarterly Theological Review has been hitherto conducted will be adhered to. Theology will be the leading feature, and the University Intelligence, Law Proceedings, &c. &c. will be continued as before.*

Early in March next will be Published,
DEDICATED (BY PERMISSION) TO THE RT. HON. MR. SECRETARY PEEL,
In Two Volumes, Quarto, with a Portrait engraved by Finden,
Price 3*l.* 3*s.* in Boards.

A HISTORY of the RIGHT HON. WILLIAM PITT, EARL OF CHATHAM. Containing his Speeches in Parliament; a considerable Portion of his Correspondence when Secretary of State, upon French, Spanish, and American Affairs, *never before published*. With an Account of the principal Events and Persons connected with his Life, Sentiments, and Administrations.

By the REV. FRANCIS THACKERAY, A.M.

London: Printed for C. and J. Rivington, Booksellers Extraordinary to His Majesty, Waterloo-Place, Pall-Mall, and St. Paul's Church-Yard.

POPULAR WORKS,

PUBLISHED BY

OLIVER & BOYD, *Edinburgh; and G. B. WHITTAKER, London.*

WILHELM MEISTER'S APPRENTICESHIP: a Novel, from the German of Goethe. In 3 vols. Post 8vo. 31s. 6d. boards.

—“It is a work of a man of high and peculiar genius, and is not to be measured by a foreign standard. Many parts of it are full of thought and beauty, and some of the poetry, even in the translation, is highly pleasing. In the first volume we find a translation of the celebrated lines which Lord Byron copied in the commencement of his *Bride of Abydos*. We ought to observe also, that the original of Sir Walter Scott's *Fenella* is to be found in the wild and singular character of *Mignon*.”—*New Monthly Magazine*.

THE MAGIC RING, a Romance, from the German of Frederick, Baron de la Motte Fouqué. 3 vols. 12mo. 21s. boards.

“We have frequently borne testimony to the wild genius and fanciful imagination of the Baron de la Motte Fouqué; but of all his works that have yet come before the English public, this appears to us the most interesting and the best.”—*New Monthly Magazine*.

LEAVES from a JOURNAL; or Sketches of Rambles in some parts of North Britain and Ireland. By A. BIGELOW, Massachusetts, United States. Small 8vo. 6s. boards.

“We have read these ‘Sketches’ with great and increasing pleasure, and we know of few works of a similar character, executed in a happier manner.”—*European Magazine*.

FANNY FAIRFIELD, the FARMER'S DAUGHTER, a Juvenile Tale. By a Lady. With a Frontispiece, designed by Uwins. 12mo. 5s. boards.

MY EARLY DAYS. 18mo. 2s. boards.

—“This is really one of the best little volumes of its class which we have ever met with.”—*Literary Gazette*.

“The story is interesting, and the moral it inculcates excellent.”—*Literary Chronicle*.

“It is beautifully written, and were we to speak of it as warmly as we felt disposed to do under the fresh impression of the perusal, we might be suspected of partiality or extravagance.”—*Eclectic Review*.

ALSO LATELY PUBLISHED,

A FOURTH EDITION of the **MORNING and EVENING SACRIFICE**, or, Prayers for Private Persons and Families. Post 8vo. 8s. and Demy 12mo. 5s. 6d. boards.

A THIRD EDITION of **MR. HOWISON'S SKETCHES of UPPER CANADA.** 8vo. 10s. 6d. boards.

A SECOND EDITION of **MR. HOWISON'S FOREIGN SCENES and TRAVELLING RECREATIONS.** 2 vols. Post 8vo. 15s. boards.

A SECOND EDITION of **PROFESSOR JARDINE'S OUTLINES of PHILOSOPHICAL EDUCATION.** Post 8vo. 10s. 6d. boards.

A SECOND EDITION of **DR. HIBBERT'S PHILOSOPHY of APPARITIONS.** Post 8vo. 12s. boards.

(*OLIVER and BOYD's Works—continued.*)

A **FOURTH EDITION** of Volume First, and a **THIRD EDITION** of Volume Second of **MR. M'DIARMID'S SCRAP BOOK**. Post 8vo. Each vol. 8s. 6d. boards.

A **THIRD EDITION** of A **SABBATH** among the **MOUNTAINS**. A Poem. Fcp. 8vo. 3s. boards.

A **SECOND EDITION** of **DR. SMITH'S CATECHISM** of **CHEMISTRY**, containing a concentrated and simple View of its Elementary Principles: with numerous Cuts. 18mo. 2s. 6d. boards.

"As an introduction to the systematic works, or to a course of lectures, we consider this Catechism a work of much utility."—*New Monthly Magazine*.

A **THIRD EDITION** of **LETTERS** from a **LADY** to her **NIECE**. 18mo. 2s. boards.

"The style is easy and elegant; the maxims inculcated are those of sound prudence and sincere virtue."—*Monthly Magazine*.

A **FOURTH EDITION** of a **FATHER'S GIFT** to his **CHILDREN**. 24mo. 2s. 6d. boards.

This work has been noticed in the most favourable manner, in the *Christian Instructor*, *British Critic*, &c. &c.

PUBLISHED THIS DAY,

The **HISTORY** of **SCOTLAND**, from the Roman Invasion till the Suppression of the Rebellion in 1745; with Exercises; for the Use of Schools, or of Private Students. By the Rev. A. STEWART. In one thick volume 12mo. 5s. bound.

"Of Mr. Stewart we had cause to speak in very favourable terms for his edition of *Nepos*; and we now owe him a higher obligation for this well-written history, than which one more eligible could not be put into the hands of youth."—*Literary Gazette*.

"The arrangement is, in our opinion, altogether admirable; indeed, we have rarely met with a work so completely fitted either for the school-room, or the private student."—*Literary Chronicle*.

OLIVER and BOYD'S New and Improved Edition of **SCOTT'S BEAUTIES** of **EMINENT WRITERS**. In 2 vols. 12mo. Vol. I. 2s. 6d. bound. Vol. II. 2s. Bound together, 4s.

SMITH'S ANALYTICAL SYSTEM of **ENGLISH GRAMMAR**, arranged upon a new and improved Plan, and illustrated by appropriate Rules, Examples, and Exercises, which are so explained as to render every part of the Grammar intelligible to the Learner. 18mo. 1s. 6d. bound.

"This work is an abridgment of Mr. Smith's *Practical Guide to the Composition and Application of the English Language*, a work which has received much approbation. The abridgment is well executed, and will, no doubt, supersede many publications of a similar nature, which are without its advantages of clear and systematic arrangement, variety and simplification of grammatical knowledge, and, more important than all, its appropriate intelligibility."—*Literary Chronicle*.

FULTON'S PRONOUNCING VOCABULARY; with Lessons in Prose and Verse, and a few Grammatical Exercises. 12mo. 2s. bound.

EWING'S ENGLISH LEARNER; or, a Selection of Lessons in Prose and Verse, adapted to the Capacity of the Younger Classes of Readers. Fourth Edition. 12mo. 2s. bound.

(OLIVER and BOYD'S Works—continued.)

EWING'S RHETORICAL EXERCISES, being a Sequel to the Principles of Elocution. 12mo. 4s. 6d. bound.

EWING'S PRINCIPLES of ELOCUTION, containing numerous Rules, Observations, and Exercises, on Pronunciation, Pauses, Inflexions, Accent, and Emphasis; also copious Extracts in Prose and Verse. Seventh Edition. 12mo. 4s. 6d. bound.

EWING'S NEW SYSTEM of GEOGRAPHY, on a new and easy Plan, from the latest and best Authorities; including also the Elements of Astronomy, an Account of the Solar System, and a Variety of Problems to be solved by the Globes. Seventh Edition, 12mo. without maps, 4s. 6d. bound: or, with nine maps, drawn and engraved for the work, 6s. 6d.

EWING'S NEW GENERAL ATLAS, containing distinct Maps of all the principal States and Kingdoms throughout the World. Royal 4to. 16s. half-bound. Coloured outlines, 18s. or full coloured, 21s.

ADAMS'S SELECT PASSAGES from the BIBLE: arranged under distinct Heads, for the Use of Schools and Families. 12mo. 4s. 6d. bound.

FULTON'S improved and enlarged Edition of JOHNSON'S DICTIONARY in Miniature: To which are subjoined, Vocabularies of Classical and Scriptural Proper Names; a concise Account of the Heathen Deities; a Collection of Quotations and Phrases, from the Latin, French, Italian, and Spanish Languages; a Chronological Table of remarkable Events; and a List of Men of Genius and Learning; with a Portrait. Fifth Edition. 18mo. 3s. bound.

SIMPSON'S HISTORY of SCOTLAND, from the earliest Period to the Visit of his Majesty, in 1822, to the Scottish Capital; with Questions for Examination at the end of each Section. Fourteenth Edition improved. 12mo. 3s. 6d. bound.

SIMPSON'S improved Edition of DR. GOLDSMITH'S HISTORY of ENGLAND, with a Continuation till 1825, and Questions for Examination. Seventh Edition. 12mo. 3s. 6d. bound.

SIMPSON'S improved Edition of DR. GOLDSMITH'S HISTORY of ROME; with Questions for Examination; Seventh Edition, revised: to which are added, Introductory Chapters, containing an Account of the Origin, Progress, Institutions, Manners, Customs, Government, Laws, and Military and Naval Affairs of the Romans. 12mo. 3s. 6d. bound.

SIMPSON'S improved Edition of DR. GOLDSMITH'S HISTORY of GREECE; with Questions for Examination; Third Edition, revised: to which are added, Introductory Chapters on the Geography, Manners and Customs, Religious Institutions, and Military and Naval Affairs of the Greeks. 12mo. 3s. 6d. bound.

STEWART'S improved Edition of DR. GOLDSMITH'S HISTORY of ENGLAND, with a Continuation to the Commencement of the Reign of George IV.: to which are subjoined, copious Exercises. Third Edition. 12mo. 5s. bound.

INGRAM'S PRINCIPLES of ARITHMETIC, explained in a Popular Manner, and its Application to real Business clearly illustrated by simple Rules and numerous Examples; with Tables of Monies, Weights, and Measures, according to the New Imperial Standards. 18mo. 1s. half-bound.

(*OLIVER and BOYD's Works—continued.*)

JOHNSTON'S ELEMENTS of ARITHMETIC, with an Appendix on Weights and Measures. 18mo. 2s. bound.

MELROSE'S PRACTICAL ARITHMETIC, improved by INGRAM. Fifth Edition. 18mo. 2s. bound.

INGRAM'S CONCISE SYSTEM of MENSURATION, containing Algebra, with Fluxions; Practical Geometry, Trigonometry, Mensuration, Land-Surveying, Gauging, &c.; with numerous cuts. 12mo. 4s. 6d. bound.

POPULAR CLASS BOOKS.

HUNTER'S RUDDIMAN'S RUDIMENTS. 12mo. 1s. 6d. bound.

HUNTER'S RUDDIMAN'S GRAMMAR. 12mo. 4s. bound.

HUNTER'S SALLUST. 18mo. 1s. 6d. bound.

HUNTER'S VIRGIL, with English Notes. 18mo. 3s. 6d. bd.

HUNTER'S HORACE, with Notes, Critical and Explanatory. 3s. 6d. bound.

HUNTER'S LIVY, Book I. to V.; with English Notes, Critical and Explanatory. 12mo. 5s. bound.

HUNTER'S LIVY, Book XXI. to XXV., with Notes, Critical and Explanatory. 12mo. 4s. 6d. bound.

STEWART'S improved Edition of **CORNELIUS NEPOS**, with Marginal Notes, a Vocabulary, Chronology, &c. Fourth Edit. 18mo. 5s. bound.

DYMOCK'S improved Edition of **SALLUST**, with Marginal Notes, and an Historical and Geographical Index, &c. Second Edit. 18mo. 2s. 6d. bound.

SURENNE'S NEW PRONOUNCING FRENCH PRIMER, containing a Vocabulary, and a Selection of Phrases, &c. Royal 18mo. 1s. 6d. sewed.

SURENNE'S NEW FRENCH MANUAL, & TRAVELLER'S COMPANION, with a Map of France, and a Plan of Paris. Royal 18mo. 4s. half-bound.

BUQUET'S NOUVEAU COURS de LITTERATURE ou Répertoire des Chefs-d'Œuvre de Corneille, Racine, Voltaire, Moliere, La Fontaine, &c. avec des Notes Historiques. 12mo. 6s. 6d. boards, or 7s. bound.

"We do not hesitate for a moment to pronounce this collection quite the best that ever came under our notice. The intention of the compiler was, as he informs us in his preface, to compose a classical selection, in which youth might at once find instruction and delight, and become versed in the style of French literature by the study of its most excellent models; and we are convinced, that all who look into his volume will allow that M. Buquet has fully accomplished his object. To every extract M. Buquet has appended the name of the author, the date of his birth and death, and, occasionally, very interesting and useful notes."—*Literary Chronicle*.

AN ELEGANT PRESENT.

In one neat pocket volume, with a Frontispiece and Vignette, engraved by James Mitchell, from Drawings by J. M. Wright, price 5s. 6d. boards.

SPECIMENS of SACRED and SERIOUS POETRY, from Chaucer to the Present Day, including Grabame's Sabbath and other Poems, and Blair's Grave; with Biographical Notices and Critical Remarks. By JOHN JOHNSTONE.

Printed for OLIVER & BOYD, Edinburgh; and GEO. B. WHITTAKER, London.

Of whom may be had, printed uniformly with the above, with beautiful Engravings, from Designs by Corbould, Uwins, Watson, &c.

The **WORKS of HENRY MACKENZIE, Esq.**, with a Critical Dissertation on the Tales of the Author. By JOHN GALT, Esq. 5s. 6d. boards.

POEMS by WILLIAM COWPER, of the Inner Temple, Esq. to which is prefixed, a Memoir of the Author, also Critical Remarks on his Poems, written expressly for this Edition. By JOHN M'DIARMID. Third Edition. Revised and Extended. 5s. boards.

GOLDSMITH'S VICAR of WAKEFIELD, ESSAYS and POEMS, with Prefatory Remarks. By JOHN M'DIARMID. 5s. boards.

PAUL and VIRGINIA, from the French of St. Pierre; and **ELIZABETH**, from the French of Madame Cottin; New Translations with Prefatory Remarks. By JOHN M'DIARMID. 3s. boards.

LETTERS of JUNIUS, with Preliminary Dissertations and copious Notes. By ATTICUS SECUNDUS. 6s. boards.

The **POEMS of OSSIAN**, translated by JAMES MACPHERSON, Esq.; with the Translator's Dissertations on the Era and Poems of Ossian; Dr. Blair's Critical Dissertation; and an Inquiry into the Genuineness of these Poems, *written expressly for this Edition*. By the Rev. A. STEWART. 5s. boards.

The **SEASONS**, with a Poem to the Memory of Sir ISAAC NEWTON. By JAMES THOMPSON. To which is prefixed, an Account of his Life and Writings. By Dr. SAMUEL JOHNSON. 2s. boards.

VALPY'S GREEK TESTAMENT, with ENGLISH NOTES.

Three Volumes 8vo. Price £2 : 5s.

GREEK TESTAMENT, Second Edition. Containing copious Critical, Philological, and Explanatory Notes, in English, from the most eminent Critics and Interpreters; with parallel Passages from the Classics; and with References to VIGERUS for Idioms, BOS for Ellipses, and HOOGEVEEN for Particles. The various Readings are recorded under the Text. Greek and English Indexes are added.

By the Rev. E. VALPY, B.D.

This Work is intended for the use of Students in Divinity, as well as the Library. Sold by Longman and Co.; Baldwin and Co.; and all Booksellers in town and country.

Where also may be had,

The **GREEK SEPTUAGINT**, from the Text of BOS and HOLMES, in One Volume 8vo. 1l. 8s. It is printed uniformly with the TESTAMENT, and is the only Septuagint in One Volume.

This Day is published, in One Volume, royal octavo, Price £1. 5s. in boards,
a New Edition of

THE BOOK of COMMON PRAYER, and ADMINISTRATION
of the SACRAMENT, and other RITES and CEREMONIES of the
CHURCH, according to the Use of the United Church of England and Ireland.
Together with such of the SUNDAY LESSONS as are taken from the Old Testa-
ment; with Notes.

By SIR JOHN BAYLEY, Kt.

London: Printed for Joseph Butterworth and Son, 43, Fleet Street; C. and J. Ri-
vington, St. Paul's Church Yard; and J. Hatchard and Son, Piccadilly.

This Day is published, in 8vo. Price 1s. sewed,

A FAREWELL SERMON, preached in the Church of the Holy
Trinity, on Sunday Morning, November 12; together with an INTRODU-
CTORY SERMON, preached in the Parish Church of Cheltenham, on Sunday
Morning, November 19, 1826,

By the Rev. FRANCIS CLOSE, A.M.
Perpetual Curate of Cheltenham.

London: Printed for J. Hatchard and Son, 187, Piccadilly, and Weller, Cheltenham.

Of whom may be had, by the same Author,

1. The BOOK of GENESIS considered and illustrated, in a
Series of Historical Discourses, preached in the Church of the Holy Trinity, Chelten-
ham. 8vo. 12s. Boards.

2. A COURSE of NINE SERMONS, intended to illustrate some
of the leading Truths contained in the Liturgy of the Church of England. Second
Edition. 12mo. 5s. Boards.

OXFORD GREEK METRES.

Just published, in Octavo, sewed, Price 3s. the Third Edition of

**A N INTRODUCTION to the METRES of the GREEK TRA-
GEDIANS.**

BY A MEMBER OF THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD.

London: Printed for M. A. Nattali, 24, Tavistock-street, Covent Garden; T. Combe,
Leicester; and Sold by T. Parker, Oxford; J. Stevenson, Cambridge; of whom
may be had M. A. Nattali's Catalogue of Old Books in fine condition, *gratis*.

In a few Days will be published, Price 4s., (allowed to Purchasers,)

A CATALOGUE of upwards of 7000 Articles in ENGLISH
THEOLOGY, ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY, and SERMONS; being the
most complete Collection which has for some time been on Sale; it comprises all the
best and most useful Works in these Classes, and many that are both curious and un-
common.

By HOWELL and STEWART, (Successors to Ogle, Duncan, and Co.)
295, Holborn.

* * * Gentlemen desirous of having the Catalogue sent to them, *immediately on publi-
cation, gratis*, are respectfully requested to transmit their names *direct* to the Publishers
without delay.

A Few Copies of the CLASSED ORIENTAL and CRITICO-BIBLICAL
CATALOGUE still remain, and a SUPPLEMENT to it is in the Press

Works recently Published by C. and J. RIVINGTON, St. Paul's Church Yard and Waterloo Place, Pall Mall.

I.

In One large Volume, 8vo. price 13s. in boards, the Second Edition of

THE ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY of the SECOND and THIRD CENTURIES. Illustrated from the Writings of Tertullian. By JOHN, BISHOP of BRISTOL, Master of Christ's College, and Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge.

II.

The HISTORY of the REFORMATION of the CHURCH of ENGLAND. By the Rev. H. SOAMES, M. A. Rector of Shelley, Essex. Volume the Third (comprising the Reign of Edward VI.) 8vo.

III.

FOREIGN CORN TRADE.

One Volume. 8vo. 12s. bds.

NOTES MADE DURING A TOUR in Denmark, Holstein, Mecklenburg-Schwerin, Pomerania, the Isle of Rugen, Prussia, Poland, Saxony, Brunswick, Hanover, the Hanseatic Territories, Oldenburg, Friesland, Holland, Brabant, the Rhine Country, and France. Interspersed with some Observations on the Foreign Corn Trade. To which are annexed the latest Prices of Corn at all the Shipping Ports on the Continent. By R. SMITH, Esq. F.R.S.L.

IV.

In 8vo. 9s. boards. Dedicated (by permission) to the Lord Bishop of London.

INSTRUCTIONS for READING the LITURGY of the UNITED CHURCH of ENGLAND and IRELAND; offered to the Attention of the Younger Clergy, and Candidates for Holy Orders: with an Appendix on Pronunciation, and a Selection of Scripture Proper Names, most liable to be variously pronounced. By the Rev. JOHN HENRY HOWLETT, M. A. Reading Chaplain of His Majesty's Chapel Royal, Whitehall; Vicar of Hollington, Sussex; and formerly Fellow of Pembroke Hall, Cambridge.

V.

In small 8vo. 6s. 6d. in boards.

ANNOTATIONS ECCLESIASTICAL and DEVOTIONAL, intended to illustrate the LITURGY, and the THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES of the UNITED CHURCH of ENGLAND and IRELAND, with an HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION. By THOMAS HARWOOD, D.D. F.S.A.

VI.

In 8vo. 10s. 6d. in boards.

SERMONS, partly Illustrative of the Devotional Services of the Church of England. By the Rev. THOMAS SIMS, M. A. Domestic Chaplain to her Grace the Duchess Dowager of Beaufort.

VII.

In 8vo. 15s. in boards.

An HISTORICAL DEFENCE of the WALDENSES, or Vaudois Inhabitants of the Vallies in Piedmont. By JEAN RODOLPHE PEYRAN, late Pastor of Pomaret, and Moderator of the Waldensian Church. With an Introduction and Appendixes. By the Rev. THOMAS SIMS.

(C. and J. RIVINGTON's *Works*—*continued*.)

VIII.

In 8vo. 6s. Boards.

A COURSE of SERMONS preached before the UNIVERSITY of CAMBRIDGE in the Year 1825. Illustrative of the Patriarchal, Mosaic, and Christian Dispensations—of the Origin and Object of the Mosaic Ritual—of the Characters of Melchisedeck and St. John the Baptist—and of the Advent of our Saviour.—Accompanied with Critical Notes. By the Rev. DANIEL GUILDFORD WAIT, L.L.D. Member of St. John's College; Rector of Blagdon, Somersetshire; and Member of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain.

IX.

In Royal 8vo. 12s. 6d. Boards.

EURIPIDIS TRAGÆDIÆ priores quatuor. Ad fidem Manuscriptorum memendatæ et brevibus Notis emendationum potissimum rationes reddentibus instructæ. Edidit RICARDUS PORSON, A.M. Græcarum literarum apud Cantabrigienses olim professor Regius. Recensuit suasque notulas subiecit JACOBUS SCHOLEFIELD, A.M. Collegii SS. Trinitatis socius et Græcarum literarum professor Regius.

X.

In 8vo. 7s. 6d. Boards.

The ELEMENTS of the THEORY of PLANE ASTRONOMY. By W. MADDY, M.A. Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge.

XI.

In 8vo. 6s. Boards.

MATHEMATICAL TRACTS on PHYSICAL ASTRONOMY, the Figure of the Earth, Precession and Nutation, and the Calculus of Variations. Designed for the use of Students in the University. By GEORGE BIDDELL AIRY, M.A. Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.

XII.

In 8vo. 14s. Boards.

The PRINCIPLES of ANALYTICAL GEOMETRY, designed for the use of Students of the University. By H. P. HAMILTON, M.A. F.R.S.E. Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge,

On the 1st of January, 1827, will be published, in One Volume 12mo., handsomely printed, and illustrated with Maps and other Engravings,

A COMPENDIOUS INTRODUCTION to the STUDY of the BIBLE.

By THOMAS HARTWELL HORNE, M. A.

Being an Analysis of "An Introduction to the Critical Study and Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures," by the same Author. In Four Parts, viz.:

- Part I. A Summary of the Evidences of the Genuineness, Inspiration, &c. of the Holy Scriptures, refuting the most modern objections of Infidels.
- Part II. On the Literary History and Interpretation of the Bible.
- Part III. A Compendium of Biblical Geography and Antiquities.
- Part IV. Introductory Prefaces to the several Books of Scripture.

London: Printed for T. Cadell, Strand, and W. Blackwood, Edinburgh.

This Volume is respectfully offered as an assistant to the studies of gentlemen at the Universities, and other Seminaries of Theological Literature, as well as to other individuals who may respectively possess the Author's larger Introduction, and who may require such an auxiliary. At the same time it will be found a Manual or Compendious Guide to the perusal of the Holy Scriptures, adapted to the use of general readers, who may not be able to purchase the original work. An Appendix will contain a list of the most useful books for facilitating the study of the Sacred Volume, with their current prices; and also, a list of Select Portions of the Bible, forming an Epitome of the Scriptures, and adapted to family or private reading; together with Tables of the Coins, Weights, and Measures, mentioned in the Bible, a concise Chronological Table, &c. &c.

Books lately Published by J. MAWMAN, Ludgate Street.

I.

ELEMENTS of LOGIC, comprising the Substance of the Article in the Encyclopædia Metropolitana, with Additions, &c. By R. WHATELY, D.D. Principal of St. Alban's Hall, and late Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. 8vo. Price 12s. Boards.

II.

WANDERINGS in SOUTH AMERICA, the North-West of the United States, and the Antilles, in the Years 1812, 1816, 1820, and 1824. With original Instructions for the perfect Preservation of Birds, &c. for Cabinets of Natural History. By C. WATERTON, Esq. 1 vol. 4to. 1l. 11s. 6d. Boards.

III.

A HISTORY of ENGLAND, from the first Invasion of the Romans to the Death of Charles I. By J. LINGARD, D.D. The Third Edition. 10 vols. 8vo. 6l. Boards.

Also, the Sixth Volume, in 4to. price 1l. 15s.; and Volumes Nine and Ten, in 8vo. price 1l. 4s., containing the Reigns of James I. and Charles I.

The succeeding (Seventh) Volume, in 4to., and the Eleventh and Twelfth Volumes, in 8vo. will bring this History down to the Revolution of 1688.

IV.

The **LAWS** of the CUSTOMS, compiled by Direction of the Lord's Commissioners of his Majesty's Treasury, and published by the appointment and under the sanction of the Commissioners of his Majesty's Customs; with Notes and Indexes. By J. D. HUME, Esq. Comptroller of his Majesty's Customs in the Port of London. 8vo. With the Supplement for 1826. 18s. 6d. Boards.

The Supplement for 1826 may be had separate. 2s. 6d.

V.

A COMPARATIVE VIEW of the DIFFERENT INSTITUTIONS for the ASSURANCE of LIVES. By C. BABBAGE, Esq. M.A. F.R.S.L. and E. &c. 8vo. 10s. 6d. Boards.

VI.

THE DISSECTOR'S MANUAL, a New Edition, with Additions and Alterations. By J. F. SOUTH, Lecturer on Anatomy at St. Thomas's Hospital. 8vo. 12s. Boards.

VII.

A CLASSICAL TOUR THROUGH ITALY. By the Rev. J. C. EUSTACE Sixth Edition, with an additional Preface by the Editor; and Translations of the various Quotations contained in the Work, a Map of Italy, &c. 4 vols. 8vo. 3l. Boards.

VIII.

HELON'S PILGRIMAGE to JERUSALEM; a Picture of Judaism in the Century which preceded the Advent of the Messiah. Translated from the German of F. Straus; with Notes and Illustrations by the Translator. 2 vols. post 8vo. 16s. Boards.

IX.

A GRAMMAR of the LATIN LANGUAGE. By C. G. ZUMPT, Professor in the Frederick's Gymnasium, Berlin. Translated from the German, with Additions, by the Rev. J. KENRICK, M.A. 8vo. 9s. Boards.

X.

EXERCISES on LATIN SYNTAX, adapted to Zumpt's Grammar. To which are added, Extracts from the Writings of Muretus. By the Rev. J. KENRICK, M.A. 8vo. 5s. Boards.

XI.

A KEY to EXERCISES, adapted to Zumpt's Grammar. By the Rev. J. KENRICK, M.A. 8vo. 5s. Boards.

This Day is Published, price 1*l.* 1*s.*—Large Paper, price 1*l.* 16*s.*

PART XIX. OF

THE ENCYCLOPÆDIA METROPOLITANA. — CONTENTS :

I. Pure Sciences—Arithmetic, complete—Algebra. II. Mixed and Applied Sciences—Light. III. Historical and Biographical Division—M. Ulpius Trajanus—Crinitus—Ælianus Hadrianus—Titus Aurelius Fulvius Boionius—Antoninus—Pius—Marcus Aurelius Antoninus Philosophus—Commodus Antoninus—Publius Helvius Pertinax—History, ch. xxx. Literature of the Age of the Antonini. IV. Miscellaneous Division—English Lexicon—EAR—ENT,—including Edinburghshire—Egypt—Ejectment—Elector—Elephant—Elixir—Embankment—Entry.

The Proprietors request the attention of the Public to the last Prospectus (which may be had gratis) of this Work. It contains an outline of the designed article on the application of Machinery to the Arts and Manufactures of Great Britain.

Printed for J. Mawman ; C. and J. Rivington ; Baldwin, Cradock, and Joy ; Sherwood, Gilbert, and Piper ; J. Duncan, London ; J. Parker, Oxford ; J. and J. J. Deighton, Cambridge ; and may be had of all Booksellers in the United Kingdom.

This Day is Published, Third Edition, Price 2*s.* 6*d.*,

A VINDICATION OF CERTAIN PASSAGES in the THIRD and FOURTH VOLUMES of the HISTORY of ENGLAND.

By JOHN LINGARD, D.D.

“It has pleased the Reviewer (Edinburgh) to constitute himself my accuser ; it remains for me to repel the accusation. If I fail in the attempt, the failure will justify his conduct ; if I succeed, and of success I cannot entertain a doubt, his will be the disgrace of defeat, and the shame of misrepresentation. He has provoked the contest—he must submit to the consequences.”—p. 8.

Printed for J. Mawman, Ludgate Street.

CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.—The Proprietors of this

Work, in announcing the Number for January, cannot omit the opportunity of expressing their satisfaction at the increasing patronage with which their publication has been favoured. Neither can they refrain from congratulating its readers on the many very interesting and valuable contributions they have been enabled, particularly during the last five months, to afford. For these contributions they are indebted to many Members of our Church, alike distinguished for their learning, their talents, and their piety ; and to the number of such contributors they trust they will be able to add.

The Proprietors again respectfully offer the “Christian Remembrancer” to the Public as a faithful compendium of the passing events which affect the interests of our venerable Church ; and they earnestly entreat the co-operation of those who may be able to forward their designs.

The Contents of the January Number are, Reviews of Alley’s *Vindicia Christiana* ; Horne and Carpenter on the Scriptures ; Bishop of London’s Charge ; Huntingford’s *Romanist Conversations* ; also, articles on Romanism contradictory to Scripture ; Bp. Kaye’s *Ecclesiastical History* ; Bishop Usher’s *Prophecy* ; Dr. Lingard’s *Vindication* ; Conversion of St. Paul ; Bishop Reynold’s *Ordination Sermon* ; Ode on Christmas Day ; Memoir of the Rev. W. Whitear ; Proceedings of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, relative to Bishop Heber and the Diocese of India ; Literary Report ; Political Retrospect ; and Clerical and University Intelligence, &c. &c.

Printed for J. Mawman, Ludgate-street ; and C. & J. Rivington, St. Paul’s Church-yard, and Waterloo-place.

This Day are published, in 18mo. Price 2*s.* boards,

H ELPS to DEVOTIONS : Morning and Evening PRAYERS for EVERY DAY in the WEEK, adapted for the Use of FAMILIES ; with SHORT PRAYERS for particular Occasions.

By the Rev. H. TATTAM, M.A. F.R.S.L.

Rector of St. Cuthert’s, Bedford.

London : Printed for J. Hatchard and Son, 187, Piccadilly.

New Works published by **BALDWIN, CRADOCK, and JOY,**
Paternoster Row.

SERMONS, EXPLANATORY and PRACTICAL, on the **THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES** of the **CHURCH of ENGLAND**, in a Series of Discourses delivered at the Parish Church of St. Alphage, Greenwich. By the **Rev. T. WAITE**, D.C.L. Chaplain to **H. R. H. the Duke of Gloucester**; and to the **Hon. and Right Reverend the Bishop of Oxford**; and Master of the Grammar School, Lewisham Hill. In one large Volume. 8vo. 16s. Boards.

A VINDICATION of the most **Rev. THOMAS CRANMER**, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, and therewith of the Reformation in England, against some of the Allegations which have been recently made by the **Rev. Dr. Lingard**, the **Rev. Dr. Milner**, and **Charles Butler, Esq.** The Second Edition, with Notices of **Dr. Lingard's** and **Mr. Butler's** Remarks on the First Edition. By the **Rev. H. J. TODD**, M.A. F.S.A. and **R.S.L. Chaplain** in Ordinary to his Majesty, and Rector of Settrington, Yorkshire. 12mo. 4s. Boards.

A PREPARATION for the **LORD'S SUPPER**, with a Companion to the Altar, intended for the use of Ladies. By **MARY CORNWALLIS**. In a neat Pocket Volume. Price 2s. bound; or in a superior manner, 2s. 6d.; in black calf, 3s.; in Morocco, 6s.

OBSERVATIONS, CRITICAL, EXPLANATORY, and PRACTICAL, on the **CANONICAL SCRIPTURES**. Second Edition, revised, corrected, and enlarged. By the same Author. 4 vols. 8vo. 2l. 2s. Boards.

A TREATISE on the **EVIDENCE** of the **SCRIPTURE MIRACLES**. By **JOHN PENROSE**, M.A. formerly of C.C. College, Oxford. 8vo. 10s. 6d. Boards.

An ENQUIRY, chiefly on **PRINCIPLES of RELIGION**, into the Nature and Discipline of Human Motives. By the same Author. 8vo. 10s. 6d. Boards.

* * * The object of this Work is, to supply a manifest desideratum in Moral and Theological Science, by showing systematically the connexion between the Principles of Religion and of Virtue.

MORNING COMMUNINGS with GOD; or, DEVOTIONAL MEDITATIONS for **EVERY DAY** of the **YEAR**. Translated from the original German of Christian Christopher Sturm, Author of "Reflections," &c. By **WILLIAM JOHNSTONE**, A.M. Second Edition. 2 vols. Copy 8vo. 16s.

CONTEMPLATIONS on the **SUFFERINGS of JESUS CHRIST**; with an Explanatory Paraphrase, and Practical Inferences. From the German of Sturm. By the same. In one Volume uniform with the preceding Work. With a Portrait of Sturm. 9s.

THE DIVINE GOVERNMENT. By **SOUTHWELL SMITH, M.D.** Fourth Edition. 12mo. 7s. 6d. Boards.

BAMPTON LECTURES, for 1826.

This Day is Published, in 8vo. Price 9s. in boards,

THE BENEFITS annexed to a Participation in the **TWO CHRISTIAN SACRAMENTS**, of **BAPTISM** and the **LORD'S SUPPER**, considered, in Eight Sermons, preached before the University of Oxford in the Year 1826; at the Lecture founded by the late **Rev. John Bampton, M.A.** Canon of Salisbury.

By **WILLIAM VAUX, B.D.**

Domestic Chaplain to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, and late Fellow of Balliol College.

Printed for **C. & J. Rivington**, St. Paul's Church Yard and Waterloo Place, Pall Mall; and **J. Parker**, Oxford.

CONTENTS

OF

Nº. I.

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| ART. I. First Report of the Commissioners of Education in Ireland. | 1 |
| II. A Geographical and Historical Description of Ancient Italy, with a Map, and a Plan of Rome. By the Rev. J. A. Cramer, M.A. late Student of Christ Church. | 25 |
| III. A Treatise on the Evidence of the Scripture Miracles. By John Penrose, M.A. | 60 |
| IV. An Historical View of the Plea of Tradition, as maintained in the Church of Rome, &c. &c. By George Miller, D.D. &c. &c. | 92 |
| V. 1. A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Derby, at the Visitations at Derby and Chesterfield, June 22 and 23, 1825 ; and published at their request. By the Rev. S. Butler, D.D. F.R.S. &c. &c. Archdeacon of Derby, and Head Master of Shrewsbury School. | |
| 2. A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Derby, at the Visitations at Derby and Chesterfield, June 15 and 16, 1826 ; and published at their request. By the Rev. S. Butler, D.D. F.R.S. &c. Archdeacon of Derby, and Head Master of Shrewsbury School. | 94 |

| ART. | PAGE |
|---|------|
| VI. Boast not thyself of to-morrow : a Sermon, preached at Middle Claydon Church, at the Funeral of General Sir Harry Calvert, Bart. G.C.B. and Lieutenant-Governor of Chelsea Hospital, who died at Claydon House, Bucks, after an illness of eight hours, Sept. 4, 1826. By the Rev. Henry Blunt, A.M. Vicar of Clare Suffolk ; Curate of Chelsea, Middlesex ; alternate Evening Preacher at the Philanthropic Society ; and late Fellow of Pembroke College, Cambridge | 99 |
| VII. A Popular Introduction to the Study of the Holy Scriptures, for the Use of English Readers. By William Carpenter. | 101 |
| VIII. Two Sermons, preached at Guildford, in the Archdeaconry of Stoke, in the County of Surrey, at the Spring and Autumn Visitations, 1825 ; the latter before the Honourable and Venerable T. De Gray, M.A. Archdeacon of Surrey. By Charles Jerram, M.A. With an Appendix, on the Subject of Baptismal Regeneration. | 110 |
| IX. The History of the Inquisition of Spain, from the time of its establishment to the reign of Ferdinand VII., composed from the Original Documents of the Archives of the Supreme Council, and from those of Subordinate Tribunals of the Holy Office. Abridged and Translated from the Original Works of D. Jean Antoine Llorente, formerly Secretary of the Inquisition, Chancellor of the University of Toledo, Knight of the Order of Charles III., &c. | 119 |
| X. 1. Précis du Système Hiéroglyphique des anciens Egyptiens, ou Recherches sur les élémens premiers de cette écriture sacrée, sur les diverses combinaisons, et sur les rapports de ce système avec les autres méthodes graphiques Egyptiennes. Par M. Champollion le Jeune. | |

| ART. | PAGE |
|--|------|
| 2. Lettres à M. le Duc de Blacas d' Aulps, Pair de France, &c. relatives au Musée royal Egyptien de Turin. Par le même. Première Lettre—Monuments Historiques. | |
| 3. Deuxième Lettre. | 141 |
| XI. A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of London, at the Visitation in July, 1826. By William, Lord Bishop of London. | 162 |
| XII. Observations on Clerical Funds; a Letter addressed to the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Chester. By the Rev. William Hale Hale, M.A. his Lordship's Domestic Chaplain, and Preacher at the Charter House. | 171 |
| XIII. 1. The Tendency of Prevalent Opinions about Knowledge, considered. A Sermon, preached before the University of Cambridge, on Commencement Sunday, July 2d, 1826. By the Rev. Hugh James Rose, M.A. of Trinity College, and Vicar of Horsham, Sussex. | |
| 2. Prospectus of the London University. | 175 |
| XIV. Pastoral Watchfulness and Zeal; particularly in Personal Instruction and Admonition. Recommended in two Sermons preached at the Bishop's Visitation at Abingdon, August 21, 1826, and August 30, 1814. By the Rev. Edward Berens, M.A. Vicar of Shoreham, Berks. | 211 |
| XV. The Office of the Christian Teacher, considered: in a Sermon preached August 23, 1826, in St. Giles's Church, Reading, at the Primary Visitation of the Lord Bishop of Salisbury; and printed at the request of his Lordship and the Clergy. By the Rev. H. H. Milman, Vicar of St. Mary, Reading. | 213 |
| XVI. Thoughts on the Erection of a Chapel of Ease in the parish of Whitwick, addressed to the Inhabitants of that parish, and particularly to those of the Townships of Thringstone and Swannington. By the Rev. Francis Mere- wether, M.A. Vicar of the Parish | 215 |

| ART. | PAGE |
|---|------|
| XVII. 1. A Farewell Sermon, preached in the Parish Church of Hodnet, in the County of Salop, April 20, 1823. By the Rev. Reginald Heber, D.D. Bishop of Calcutta. | |
| 2. The Omnipresence of God.—A Sermon preached Aug. 5, 1825, on the Consecration of the Church of Secrole, near Benares. By Reginald, Lord Bishop of Calcutta. | |
| 3. The Blessedness of the faithful and wise Steward—A Funeral Sermon, preached in St. John's Church, Trinchinopoly, April 9, 1826, on the Decease of the Right Rev. Reginald, Lord Bishop of Calcutta. By the Rev. Thomas Robinson, M.A. Domestic Chaplain to his Lordship. | |
| 4. A Sermon, preached in the Cathedral Church of St. John, in Calcutta, on Sunday, April 23, 1826, on occasion of the Death of the Right Rev. Reginald, Lord Bishop of Calcutta. By the Rev. Daniel Corrie, LL.B. Archdeacon of Calcutta. | 219 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| State of the Dioceses in England and Wales. | 250 |
| Proceedings of the Universities.—Oxford. | 264 |
| Cambridge | 269 |
| Dublin | 274 |
| List of Foreign Theological Publications | 279 |

THE
BRITISH CRITIC,
Quarterly Theological Review,
AND
ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.

JANUARY, 1827.

XXIII. C. 1

ART. I.—*First Report of the Commissioners of Education in Ireland.*

IT will be in the recollection of our readers that, in the year 1820, Mr. Brougham submitted to the House of Commons a bill for the extension and improvement of National Education. It cannot be supposed that he entered upon the inquiries by which that measure was preceded, with any sentiment of extraordinary partiality for the Established Church. Yet the result was so decidedly favourable to the established clergy as to induce him to entrust to them the management and direction of the system which he then deemed the best; and which, be it observed, differs in nothing essential from that which is at present pursued with so much success by the National Society for the Education of the Poor in the Principles of the Established Church, and by the Association for discountenancing Vice in Ireland. This was, certainly, a pleasing tribute to the unobtrusive worth of a body of men, whose usefulness and respectability it has been but too much the object both of Mr. Brougham and his party to decry: and we regret that his general politics prevented that hearty concurrence in his plan, on the part of the more constitutional members, which might have ensured its substantial adoption. But the church was cautious and cold. Its motto seemed to be "Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes;" while the dissenting interest, one and all, exclaimed "Et tu, Brute." To secure the goodwill of the latter powerful body has ever been an important object with Mr. Brougham, and it is understood that he abandoned his bill from no ill-founded apprehension that, if he persevered in it, he would forfeit their confidence, if not provoke their hostility.

The respect for the church evinced on that occasion by Mr. Brougham, is very remarkably contrasted with the spirit which led to the appointment of the Education Commissioners, on whose First Report we propose to offer a few observations. It is impossible not to feel some surprise at a selection of persons, for the performance of so important a duty, by which every form of religious worship seems to be sufficiently represented, *except that of the Established Church*. We are willing to give the very respectable individuals who compose the present commission credit for being actuated by what appeared to them honest and praiseworthy motives. They have certainly been diligent in the prosecution of their inquiries, and, according to their views and principles, sincerely anxious for the promotion of the great work which they had in hand. And if a sectarian bias appears throughout to have directed their views and influenced their determinations, there is no room for wonder on the part of such as are acquainted with the acknowledged principles of the majority of them, and who know how absolutely prejudices are wont to tyrannize over rectitude of purpose and strength of understanding.

The Report contains the results of the Commissioners' inquiries respecting the several institutions at present existing in Ireland for the purpose of promoting education amongst the poor. Of these the principal are the Incorporated Society, the Association for discountenancing Vice, and the Kildare Street Institution. The first, the Incorporated Society, is that which has principally moved the wrath of the commissioners; and we shall, accordingly, in the first place, direct the reader's attention to it, and bestow upon it a degree of consideration, perhaps, disproportioned to its importance. The mode in which the inquiry was prosecuted respecting this institution strikingly illustrates the spirit by which the inquisitors were actuated, and proves, at least, how little they are chargeable with any of that weakness denominated "the charity that hopeth all things."

The Incorporated Society dates its charter from the year 1733; and owes its origin to a strong desire expressed on the part of the individuals most distinguished for rank and influence amongst the Protestants of Ireland, to be aided by government in a systematic exertion for the conversion of the natives. The following extract from a letter of Primate Boulter sufficiently expresses the views by which the dignitaries and the clergy of the church of Ireland were actuated at the period when government thought fit so far to comply with their solicitations:—

"The great numbers of Papists in this kingdom, and the obstinacy with which they adhere to their own religion, occasions our trying what may be done with their children to bring them over to our church; and

the good success the corporation established in Scotland for the instruction of the ignorant and barbarous part of that nation has met with, encourages us to hope, if we were incorporated for that purpose here, that we might likewise have some success in our attempts to teach the children of the Papists the English tongue and the principles of the Christian religion ; and several gentlemen here have promised subscriptions for maintaining schools for that purpose, if we were once formed into a corporate body. This has set the principal nobility, gentry, and clergy here on presenting an address to his Majesty to erect such persons as he pleases into a corporation here for that purpose, which we have sent over by the Lord Lieutenant, to be laid before his Majesty. The copy of this address I have here sent your lordship, in which you will in some measure see the melancholy state of religion in this kingdom ; and I do in my own name and that of the rest of my brethren beg the favour of your lordship to give it your countenance. I can assure you the Papists are here so numerous, that it highly concerns us, in point of interest as well as out of concern for the salvation of these poor creatures, who are our fellow subjects, to try all possible means to bring them and theirs over to the knowledge of the true religion ; and one of the most likely methods we can think of is, if possible, instructing and converting the young generation ; for instead of converting those that are adult, we are daily losing many of our meaner people, who go off to Popery."

Thus was this institution founded, at a period when a parliamentary grant a good deal anticipated that active spirit of public benevolence which has, in our day, performed such wonders in the cause of charity. We were therefore prepared to hear that precisely the same degree of activity was not to be found amongst its early members, as distinguishes those institutions which have originated in the fervour of religious zeal, and are wholly maintained by voluntary contributions. There are few things more difficult than the judicious management of the concerns of a charitable institution. Men must be volunteers in the cause, and act from a spontaneous impulse, before they are fit to undertake it. Where the task of directing the measures of a society, or superintending any of its departments, is attached to some official post, and not undertaken from inclination, the deepest sense of duty is required to render such superintendence efficient ; and in spite of every exertion abuses will occasionally creep in. We were prepared therefore to hear that charges existed against the Incorporated Society, to a degree that would justify a rigid and serious inquiry. Such an inquiry has taken place ; and our astonishment remains at present unabated, that the commissioners, considering the spirit by which they were actuated, have not been able to establish a stronger case against an institution which they are anxious to consider as the scape-goat, by the sacrifice of which the Romanists were to be propitiated, and atonement made for

the offences of Protestant mismanagement in the conduct of national education in Ireland.

Charges against this society, of the gravest nature, are most confidently and unscrupulously preferred. Its governors are charged, by implication, with negligence; its school-masters are accused of cruelty, and its officers of corruption. Upon each of these charges we shall have occasion to say a few words. With respect to the first, the following is the statement contained in the Report :—

“ By the rules of the society, the catechists are required to report their opinions in all matters respecting each school to the society, at least once a month, and the committee of fifteen are authorized to grant a gratuity of £2 : 10s. per quarter, in addition to the usual salary, to every catechist who shall have complied with the society's regulations. Since the office of visitor has been discontinued, the only regular means of obtaining information of the condition of the schools is from these monthly communications of the catechists. The following extract from the examination of the secretary of the society, taken the 30th of October, 1824, will show how much of their duty in this respect is neglected, while at the same time we learn from the same officer, that he is not aware of an instance in which a part of the salary of a catechist has been withheld for the last 15 or 20 years.

Q. ‘ If the rules of the society were observed, is it not the fact that each catechist would monthly have reported upon his own respective school?’

A. ‘ Yes.’

Q. ‘ There are about thirty schools belonging to the society?’

A. ‘ Yes.’

Q. ‘ It would follow that about 270 monthly reports at least ought ere now to have been made; of these 270, how many have been made, as nearly as you can answer?’

A. ‘ There is a very small proportion; I cannot tell how many.’

Q. ‘ Have ten been received?’

A. ‘ From the 1st of January to the 1st of October there ought to have been nine letters from each catechist; that would be 270 letters.’

Q. ‘ How many of these 270 have you received?’

A. ‘ I declare I do not think there are 50.’

Q. ‘ Do you believe that as many as ten out of those 270 regular monthly reports have been received by you?’

A. ‘ Upon my word, I doubt it.’

Q. ‘ Can you recollect any one instance in which a catechist has made one of his monthly returns since the 1st of last January?’

A. ‘ I do not think there is.’”

Here the governors are represented as liable to the charge of very gross neglect of duty, in having omitted to animadvert upon the conduct of the catechists for not having furnished their monthly reports; and of the 270 such reports which should have been

received, parliament and the public are given to understand, that not a single one had been transmitted to the secretary. But what will parliament and the public think when they find that this representation derives all its plausibility from the omission of the concluding part of Mr. Adamson's last answer, which is not given in the Report although it is contained in the Appendix. Mr. Adamson had understood the question to refer not strictly to the monthly letters, but to the regular series of reports for which the catechists were responsible. And as no one series had been up to that period completed, Mr. Adamson felt himself justified in stating that no such series had been received. The statement of the commissioners is the more extraordinary, as, at the time of making the Report, they were actually in possession of 68 out of 70 monthly letters which had been received in the interval between January and October, in the year 1824; notwithstanding which, they felt themselves justified in representing the catechists as not having, up to that period, furnished one of their reports, the governors as having either overlooked or connived at this shameful negligence, and the secretary as guilty, in his evidence before them, of gross and scandalous prevarication!

With respect to the charges of cruelty, which have been preferred against the masters, little remains for us to say, as they have been, in every instance where it was sought to establish them by proof, specifically discredited in a court of justice. The commissioners themselves are, perhaps, by this time, aware, how very little the severity of their animadversions, in this particular, has been borne out by subsequent investigation. And if they possess the feelings of common humanity, they must lament that they were so lightly moved to wound the feelings, injure the characters, and possibly destroy the prospects of an humble and meritorious class of individuals, upon the *ex parte* statements of mischievous and idle boys, whose subsequent evidence was found to be as inconsistent as their statements were malevolent and unfounded.

In page 21 of the Report, we find the following passage:—“We have already mentioned the severe punishment of two boys at New Ross school for a similar offence;” (*viz.* that of preferring complaints against the masters,) “and in the examination of William Lewis will be found a statement of a severe beating which he received, for having, as was suggested, advised another boy to complain to the rector of the parish.” Now, would not the reader suppose, upon reading this passage, that the statement of Lewis referred to a transaction different from the case of the two boys; that, in fact, two distinct acts of cruelty were thereby intimated? How will he be surprized then to learn, that these distinct acts are

one and the same; and that Lewis is himself one of those two boys from whose case his own is represented as distinguished!

Not only have the commissioners relied, with what we must be permitted to call a most unamiable credulity, on the unsupported statements of the boys respecting matters of fact, but they report as matter of fact what was frequently no more than conjecture or inference; conjecture always vague or malicious, and inference absurd or erroneous. This, we are bold to assert, in cases where the interests and characters of individuals and of an institution were concerned, establishes against the commissioners a stronger case of partiality and negligence than they have been able to prove in any of the instances by which they have endeavoured to support such allegations. Mr. Adamson had occasion to make an addition to his house, and for that purpose had some dealings with two or three of the Society's tradesmen. The honesty of these transactions might have been proved by his receipts; and the tradesmen, two of whom were living, and residing in Dublin, were willing, as now appears, to make oath that he paid them a fair market price for the articles with which he was furnished by them. The commissioners, however, do not think proper to examine either of them; while they give no small countenance to the calumny, that the building materials were procured by what would amount to a fraud upon the public.

We have dwelt at so much length on this part of the subject, chiefly because we consider that the statements which have been made sufficiently exemplify the spirit by which the commissioners were actuated in the course of their inquiries. Perhaps the only principle of unity by which they were held together was a strong disrelish of every thing connected with the established church. Their appointment we believe to have been a sacrifice to what is miscalled conciliation; to that disposition, so unhappily prevalent, to propitiate every species of dissent by a compromise of principle. There could be no greater error.

To our minds nothing can be clearer than the line which should be drawn between sectaries and the members of the established church. The latter alone are entitled to encouragement; to the former, a liberal toleration may be extended. When dissenters are freely indulged in separating from the national church, and worshipping God according to the dictates of their consciences, they have nothing to complain of. The established church is recognized by government as the great instrument of national instruction. It is *established* only because it is best fitted for such a purpose. To attain the temperate mean between superstition and enthusiasm, to provide for all religious wants without ministering to any fanatical extravagance, to secure the alliance

between what is rational and what is spiritual, that sound doctrine may be subservient to calm and exalted piety, and religion be fixed upon a sustained and unprecariois elevation, these seem to be the great desiderata in any system of national Christianity, which aims at so embodying scriptural truths in its devotional observances as that they may become deeply and extensively and permanently influential upon the hearts and minds of those to whom they are conveyed. And a great blessing and encouragement, no doubt, it is, that a system of liturgical piety is scarcely conceivable by which these advantages could be more effectually attained than they are at present by the forms of sound words which constitute the services of our establishment. In almost every other system, either the affections are sacrificed to the cold, unenlightened abstract reason, or the reason is sacrificed to passion and enthusiasm, or the incubus of superstition broods in gloomy predominance over the whole moral and intellectual nature of its votary. But, in the services of the established church, cordial piety is so made to conspire with wholesome doctrine, that the most exalted devotion and the most sublime philosophy may be truly said to meet and kiss each other. It is no small tribute to their unrivalled excellence that, in many cases, those sects which, at their outset, were readiest to disparage them, have, when the fever of fanaticism had subsided, returned to them as from husks which might fill but could not satisfy;—practically acknowledging that they contained wholesome spiritual food, and that, in departing from them, they were but hewing out unto themselves cisterns that held no water.

Such, then, being the character of our establishment, it should be, by all fair means, upheld and cherished. It is the more entitled to countenance and support, as its great ends can only be secured by addressing the calm enlightened reason, without conciliating the prejudices or appealing to the passions. Other systems, partaking more of human imperfection, may be tolerated, as long as they do not interfere with the ends of good government, and when they clearly arise out of a fervid religious sincerity, which manifests itself by the sacrifices and privations which are necessary for their support and adoption. But no further encouragement should be given to them. The legislator should act upon the principle, that these eccentric movements in the religious world have all a tendency to rectify themselves. And, satisfied with having adopted and established that which is best, and which, alone, is calculated to subsist in permanent connection with our national institutions, he should patiently await the mellowing influence of time in allaying the bitterness of hostility; and rest satisfied, that long after the disappearance of those me-

teors which, to the inexperienced, portended its overthrow, its mild and steady effulgence will still beam from on high, and be "as the shining light that shineth more and more unto the perfect day." In truth, the one depends upon its intrinsic excellence, its deeply seated accommodation to the nature of man, and its subserviency to the purpose of educating, in the highest degree, his moral powers and capacities. The others arise out of individual character, and derive their principal support from the prevalence of some erroneous notion or fantastical prejudice which happens to be epidemic for a season. "*Opinionum commenta delet dies, naturæ judicia confirmat.*" And every degree of encouragement, beyond the limits of a liberal toleration, which the "*opinionum commenta*" in religious matters receive, has a tendency only to confirm and render fixed an evil that would otherwise have been but temporary. In other words, it has a tendency to convert an acute into a chronic disease. If we leave dissenting congregations to themselves, they will naturally expire, and those who belonged to them will again become connected with the establishment. In whatever degree we give them encouragement, in the same degree we furnish them with both the motive and the means for continuing in existence, long after the causes to which they owed their origin have ceased to be influential. Who would now think of raising a formidable party against the church, by objecting to the use of the surplice? Yet we know that such and similar causes did once give rise to schism, and have, in Ireland, given rise to a sect, which, we speak with perfect certainty, would not now continue to subsist but for the support and encouragement which it has received in the shape of a *regium donum*. We mean not, at present, to pronounce any opinion on the policy or impolicy of such a measure, but merely to use the fact to which we have adverted as an illustration of the principle for which we contend, namely, that a sect which has arisen and could only subsist upon the strength of some popular prejudice, which was, in fact, but a sort of life-renter of whatever power or influence it possessed, may, by the application of royal or parliamentary bounty, be enabled to hold possession of its errors and privileges by a lease on lives renewable for ever. It is hardly credible, that the laity of the Presbyterian persuasion can have any very violent antipathy to our services, when they are as frequent attendants upon the church as upon the conventicle. And it is hardly credible, that their clergy have any very violent objection to our doctrines, while most of them bring up their own children for the church. But the *regium donum* is a good thing, a much more substantial ground to build upon than the objection against surplices; and, as long as it continues to be given, we

may be well assured, that neither will the congregations want ministers or the ministers congregations.

But upon this subject no more at present; suffice it to say, that if we are right in the view which we have taken of the position which the Established Church should occupy when so important a subject as national education is concerned, it cannot be expected that we should approve of a commission constituted as the present is. It has the appearance of a committee formed by the joint consent of Presbyterians, Roman Catholics, and Soci-nians, to the exclusion of all who could fully or fairly represent the sentiments of the Church of England. Such are the men to whose lot it has fallen to inquire into and report upon the nature and efficacy of the various systems of education which are, at present, operative in Ireland. If the utility and advantages of our church establishment were properly understood and appreciated, this could not possibly have been the case; and, therefore, it was that we felt ourselves called upon to plead its title and to stand upon its prerogatives, that at least our voices may be raised against a sentence of sweeping condemnation, by which it is sought to be superannuated, and deprived of all efficient control in the management of a concern over which it is peculiarly called upon to preside, and over which hitherto, even in the judgment of its enemies, it has presided with advantage to the country.

Every age has its moral epidemic, against which, it would almost seem from experience, that precaution and prescription must alike prove fruitless. It arises out of the temper of the public mind, and is seemingly as much without the sphere of human regulation as the ebbing and flowing of the tide. In the time of the unhappy Charles the First, it manifested itself in religious enthusiasm. Antipathy to Popery, the most abhorrent, and a zeal for monstrous speculative dogmas, not less opposed to Holy Scripture than Popery itself, distinguished that distracted age. The reign which followed was remarkable for a most pestilent relaxation of morals. Popery revived, and infidelity became fashionable. To this succeeded what may be called the anti-religious age, when infidel opinions were more systematically arrayed against all settled and serious belief in the immortality of the soul and a state of retribution. During this period, the Humes and the Gibbons, and the Voltaires, were lords of the ascendant. Then followed the age of social regeneration and political reform, when the privileges of brutes were mistaken for the rights of man, and the tremendous explosion of the French Revolution made every government in Europe rock to its foundations. The special providence of God preserved these favoured islands from the wreck and devastation by which almost every other

country was visited; and a sense of religion began to revive, manifesting itself in projects of charity and usefulness, which proved the zeal and the benevolence, if not the wisdom, of the projectors. If we were called upon to describe the epidemic of the present age, we should say that it consists in an ungovernable propensity to promote the moral welfare of the world by means but ill calculated for accomplishing that important object. Ill considered projects of education, and wild and impracticable efforts at conversion, are now the vogue. These are, in our day, to accomplish every thing for the moral and social regeneration of man, which was formerly, in the dreams of revolutionary philosophers, anticipated from the principles of liberty and equality. And any distrust of the wisdom or efficiency of their plans is regarded, by the modern illuminés, with censure quite as unsparing, and, perhaps, if similar power existed, might be treated with a severity as tremendous, as was exhibited during the hour of their tyrannical ascendancy by the heroes of revolutionary Paris.

We are, therefore, fully sensible with what little effect, as long as the delusion lasts, our warning voice can be raised. But as the time must come, sooner or later, when more sober notions will prevail, we will even cast our bread upon the waters, and state fully and fearlessly in what we conceive the errors and the dangers to consist which are to be apprehended from the present spirit of popular politico-theology.

The error of the modern theorists consists in supposing, that education, as far as it is practicable to diffuse it through the mass of the people, implies moralization: that the great majority of those who are taught to read will make a good rather than a bad use of that privilege, and forthwith betake themselves to the reading of the holy Scriptures. Now it does not require any very profound wisdom to know, that such an opinion is unfounded; for it is not necessary to believe in the ultra-doctrine of the utter depravity of human nature, in order to be convinced that it is quite sufficiently corrupt to render the theory of these amiable enthusiasts delusive. Unfortunately for their scheme, the instincts which Providence has implanted in the inferior animals, and which enable them to distinguish poisonous from wholesome pastures, are wanting in moral and responsible creatures, whose virtue and intelligence consist in the sincerity and discrimination with which they endeavour, and are enabled, to separate moral good from moral evil, and to choose the one, while they refuse the other. In whatever degree, therefore, education is to be beneficial to them, it cannot be greater than the degree in which such sincerity exists, and such discrimination is exerted.

Thus we are compelled to believe that education may be

afforded to the lower orders without furnishing them with the means or the inducements to become virtuous and useful members of society. In the case of the eleemosynary institutions in Ireland, there are many amiable and excellent individuals at present employed in sowing the seed of which future Hunts and Paines, and Cobbets, will reap the harvest. For that degree of education which might enable them to detect and expose the pretensions of these empyrics is far beyond their reach. They are not brought up in sound principles of religious faith and moral and political duty. They are just educated sufficiently to have their vanity excited and their understandings bewildered. Their faculties are stirred up to insurrection against all those good and useful purposes which education might be expected to answer. They are taught to feel a pride in thinking for themselves; that is, in setting their own crude notions in opposition to the wisdom of the better instructed members of the community; and thus become, in the hands of some daring demagogue, the ready instruments for the accomplishment of the worst designs that could be conceived by reckless wickedness, or attempted by adventurous audacity.

In the present age, the education of the lower orders requires direction rather than encouragement. The great object of those who would be their real friends should be to endeavour to render that education conducive to their genuine welfare. To be enabled to read and write merely in order to swell the number of Mr. Cobby's worshippers, or to acquire such a smattering of divinity as may inspire them with a contempt for the established church, we are sufficiently old-fashioned not to hail as any very great prognostics of national regeneration. And we are deeply persuaded that there are numbers at present in course of instruction, who will never be otherwise benefited by it than by being rendered less teachable and more loquacious. It becomes the legislature to look in time to this. If measures of a very decisive nature, and these too very different from any that have been as yet recommended by education-fanciers, be not taken, and that speedily, the consequences will be tremendous. The effects of the animalized intelligence, which has been for some time fermenting among the lower orders of the Irish, are becoming truly formidable. In order to be convinced of this, we have only to observe the manner in which it has already manifested itself in what is called the combination of trades—a combination which threatened to be, and, but for the calamity which befel the commercial classes, in all probability would have proved, as extensive and dangerous a conspiracy as ever was contrived against the peace and well-being of society. It would have been the most perfect realization of the fable of the members conspiring against the belly. But we merely allude to it now as one of the signs of the times; one of those symptoms

of that ruinous selfish insubordination, to which all short-sighted plans of education must necessarily give rise, until society becomes rent and divided by the operation of a principle which, instead of blending the upper and lower classes in harmonious connexion, has the effect of arraying them against each other in hostile conflict.

The reader will have collected, by this time, that, with the popular notions on the subject of education, we by no means sympathise. Little, we are persuaded, is necessary to be done in the way of encouragement; and government should not, perhaps, in any case do more than furnish the more intelligent and capable of the lower orders with facilities for carrying on their education beyond the point where they themselves might be disposed to stop, and up to which it is, at least, just as likely to be productive of evil as of good, both to themselves and to the community. We are no friends to the forcing system; but much might be done by the establishment of parochial libraries, and a well contrived system of examination. Suppose a general diocesan examination were annually held of the young persons who had most distinguished themselves at the parochial examinations; the course of study to be such as might best tend to confirm them in the soundest religious and political principles. For every such mind thus securely placed beyond the reach of moral and political contagion, and able to give a reason for the faith that was in them, many important advantages would be gained. When these go astray, every one knows that the harm they do is not confined to their own individual aberrations from the right way. They become, according to the mediocrity of their station, the leaders of parties in politics, and sects in religion. To prevent so serious an evil would, in itself, be no small good. But, to turn the activity that might be thus mischievously employed into the right channel, and render it subservient to utility and goodness, would surely be to confer a lasting benefit on the community. The sentiments and opinions of the multitude are never acquired by the individuals composing it for themselves: that would require an exercise of thought, which would be, to them, insupportably operose and irksome. No. They are imparted by those whose superior strength of will or powers of understanding give them some degree of authority. These become the influencing minds; by which the ideas and the feelings of their associates are moulded. They are the queen-bees, by whom the swarm is governed. Much, then, will depend on the use or abuse of the influence which they possess. And much, we are persuaded, might be done to guard against the one and to secure the other, by the judicious working of a system like that to which we have alluded, and which would

provide, as far as human regulation could secure it, that the persons described should be imbued with such feelings, furnished with such knowledge, and confirmed in such principles, as would inspire them with a cordial attachment to the church and state, and render them good Christians, good citizens, and good subjects. It is not often, willingly, or of malice prepense, that they deviate into improper courses: much more frequently are they drifted from their moorings by ignorance, and from not possessing the anchorage of some steady intelligible principle. If none were dissenters but those who, upon due deliberation, rejected the doctrine and discipline of our church, what a reduction would take place in the congregations of the conventicle! And if none were traitors but those who, in political matters, exercised a similar discrimination, how would the orators of Palace Yard be bereaved of admiring hearers! But active minds, with a newly-acquired appetite for knowledge, being left without proper aid and direction in the choice of their intellectual food, are only, by what has been done for them, swept and garnished for the occupancy of the first evil spirit that comes in their way. But fortify them by useful knowledge; secure them by good principles; and the tempter will not find them unprepared. They will be possessed of an antiseptic against the contagion of sedition and immorality; and will not only continue untainted themselves, but become the blessed means of moral health and political sanity to thousands.

For this purpose, we know of no other instrument of which government either can or need avail itself, than the Established Church. It is either eminently calculated to be thus useful, or it is not fit to be a church established. And, let it never be forgotten, it is in the hands of the government. They may make it what they please. In their hands it may become either the greatest blessing that could be conferred, or the greatest curse that could be inflicted upon the community. If they take care of it, it will, assuredly, take care of them. It is the palladium, upon the safe keeping of which depends the security of the constitution. And if they would enjoy the full measure of that political utility to which it may be made subservient, let them keep it in a state of perfect fitness for the discharge of its higher spiritual functions. Whenever the latter are subordinated to the former, and appointments made merely or chiefly with political views, government are not only chargeable with a species of guilt, which is well calculated to provoke God's anger, but, even humanly speaking, with a species of folly very like his who killed the hen that used to lay for him the golden eggs. No temporary advantages, which can be gained by such an act, can be a compensation for the permanent injury of which it must be productive both to the church and the

country. It would be like breaking up for fuel the machinery of a coal-mine. The obvious interest of government, therefore, thus conspiring with the security and well-being of the Church, in proportion as this is understood, it is but reasonable to suppose that it will be reverently and affectionately cherished, and well and wisely administered. And this being the case, there remains no room for doubting either its willingness to undertake, or its fitness to execute, such a general superintendence over an approved system of national education, as would answer every desirable end.

Education is, to the lower orders, very like the boon which *Æolus* conferred upon *Ulysses*, viz. a bag containing the elements of storms. As long as it remained in the safe keeping of its wise and discreet master, it enabled him to proceed in his course rejoicing; but when he fell asleep, and the sailors, in their folly, untied the silver bands that bound it, it disclosed, from its pregnant womb, tempests and hurricanes, which well nigh buried them in the deep. Even so will it be with the education of the lower orders of the Irish, if it be not safely managed and properly superintended. It is not so much the expansive power, by which they might be enabled to dilate their energies, that is wanting, as the controlling and regulating power by which these energies might be compressed and directed. At present, they are exposed to the influence of excessive and preternatural excitation. Every thing is done to stimulate, and but little to steady them. The stranger, to use a homely phrase, has been suffered to get into their heads. And, if the over-ruling Providence of God do not, in some extraordinary way, interfere to prevent it, every thing seems quietly preparing for a moral earthquake, by which society will be shaken to its centre; but which is, perhaps, the only thing that could disturb the complacency of modern education-mongers, or scatter their hallucinations.

But what is to be done for the *Sectarians*?—A strange question, truly!—As if it were not enough that they are permitted, within certain reasonable limits, to do what they please for themselves. So long as it may with truth be said that those who are not against the Church are for it, so long may they safely be thus indulged with a permission to take their own means of educating and moralizing their own members. This is the safe scriptural rule, which is sanctioned by the example of our Lord, and which, while it inculcates the wisdom, teaches also the limits of toleration. But surely those, who are thus tolerated, have no right to turn upon the state and upbraid it, because it does not choose to adopt and cherish the courses which they are pleased to prescribe for themselves. A system of education, to be entitled to public sanction and support, should partake of the spirit and conspire with the

ends of the church which is by law established. It should be studiously calculated not to give reasonable offence, to be accessible by all who might choose to avail themselves of it, and subservient to the purpose of diffusing the principles of enlightened loyalty and true religion. When these important objects are attained, all that is practicable is accomplished; and nothing more can be attempted without endangering the security of the whole system.

But, in a system of national education, intended for the benefit of Ireland, the prejudices of the Roman Catholics, it is thought, ought to be consulted. We are of opinion that nothing is gained, and that much may be lost, by a compromise of that kind. Education, to be effectual, must be sought for and valued. If it be so valued, the Roman Catholics will avail themselves of it, wherever nothing is done which could reasonably offend their feelings. This, even the experience of the commissioners is sufficient to prove. If it be not so valued, it can seldom do any good, and will only be brought into suspicion by being obtruded upon them. The value of the gift will be depreciated by the very anxiety to confer it; and those, who might otherwise have humbly solicited it as a boon, will fancy that we could not be so desirous of bestowing it on them without some sinister object.

But, once for all, we must protest against the notion, that the established church is to be regarded as an offence by any of the subjects of this realm; or that the prejudices and aversions of those who dissent from it are to have an influence upon the mind of parliament, in assigning the station in which it is entitled to be upheld in the country. If others respected its rights, as much as it has respected their scruples, there could be but little occasion to apprehend molestation or disturbance. But a permission to dissent is now of little value if not accompanied by a license to revile; and those, who ought to be thankful for the indulgence of professing their own religious peculiarities with impunity, feel themselves justified, by the lax and unprincipled liberality of the age in which we live, in making them a ground for limiting and restraining both the sphere of exertion and the freedom of action in the church which has been adopted by the state, and the maintenance of which, in the plenitude of its rights, is essential to the moral well-being of the community and the integrity of the constitution.

The commissioners have expressed a strong opinion, that the act of the 28th Henry the Eighth is still obligatory, which enjoins the clergy to keep parochial schools, for the purpose of encouraging, amongst the natives, the adoption of the English habit and language. They confess, indeed, that it has, in some respects,

become obsolete; and even Mr. Blake, we fancy, would scarcely insist that the Protestant clergy of the present day should be compelled, under the penalty of deprivation of their benefices, to teach the peasantry to tell their beads. With this opinion of the commissioners we do not quarrel; and if they were as anxious to place the church precisely in the position contemplated by that act, making all due allowance for change of time and circumstances, as they appear to be to find some sort of substitute for the duty which was then imposed, they would have done every thing upon that subject which we consider either necessary or desirable. It is clear, that the injunction to teach the English language, and promote the adoption of the English habit, contemplated the church in its political as well as its moral relation to the state. The Irish language was, at that time, the menstruum of disaffection, and as long as the Irish habit prevailed it would keep alive unkindly and irritating recollections. Accordingly the clergy were directed to use their influence, and take every proper means in their power, to remove what were then considered the most formidable obstacles to national tranquillity and improvement. By causing the disuse of comparatively barbarous, and the substitution of comparatively civilized customs, by which the feelings and habits of the people would be, in some measure, assimilated to those of their conquerors, they would be crushing the cockatrice of rebellion in the egg, and doing more for the stability of British dominion than could, at that time, be accomplished by the most splendid victory. The danger at the present day is not what it was then. The degree in which the Irish language and habit at present prevails is not such as to cause any anxiety in the mind of the most hypochondriacal alarmist. Ireland will never be separated from England, until England shall have been revolutionized. British connexion will only terminate when the British constitution is in danger. The same causes, and none other, which sap the one will dissolve the other. Therefore a wise government, which contemplated the national clergy as they were certainly contemplated in the act of Henry the Eighth, would endeavour to devise some means by which they might be as useful in preventing the spread of disaffection, as it was then attempted to make them in eradicating national antipathy. This is not to be done by merely enjoining them, in conjunction with Roman Catholics and Presbyterians, to catechise their own flocks. To suppose an act of parliament necessary for such a purpose would be to pay a very bad compliment to the established church. If the spirit of the act of Henry the Eighth is to be recognized in any injunction to be imposed upon the clergy, they must be placed in a condition for

doing all that can be done, by legitimate means, not only for mitigating barbarism and correcting immorality, but also for exercising a wholesome moral control over the disturbing forces which are insensibly operating the derangement of our civil and social system.

But it is time to descend to the "*res gestæ*" of the commissioners. The following is the account which they give of the origin and establishment of "*The Association for discountenancing Vice.*"

" Association incorporated for discountenancing Vice, and promoting the Knowledge and Practice of the Christian Religion.

" This society originated on the 9th of October, 1792, in a meeting of three individuals, members of the Established Church, who entered into certain resolutions, in the first of which the objects of the founders were thus explained :—

" Resolved, ' That the rapid progress which infidelity and immorality are making throughout the kingdom calls loudly on every individual, both of the clergy and of the laity, who has at heart the welfare of his country, or the honour of God, to exert all his powers to stem the baneful torrent. But as many may be disheartened by considering the impotence of separate attempts to discountenance vice, and to promote the cause of religion and piety, it appears to us advisable to associate for that laudable purpose.'

" In the infancy of the society its funds were chiefly employed in the purchase of Bibles and Prayer Books, in printing religious and moral Tracts (which were circulated by the members at reduced prices), and in distributing premiums for the promotion of catechetical examinations. Their operations, however, must necessarily have been on a limited scale, as we find that the subscriptions received between 1792 and 1800 amounted only to £1,989 : 13s. 8d.

" In the year 1800 the society was incorporated by an act of the legislature, and in the following year a grant of £300 was voted to it by parliament. Encouraged by this support, the association determined to extend the sphere of their operations. The distribution of religious works, and the premiums given at the catechetical examinations were increased, and a resolution was taken to apply a part of the augmented funds to the support of schools.

" The Association being supported and managed by clergymen of the Established Church, the assistance afforded by it was particularly directed to the schools which, by the Acts of 28th Henry 8th, cap. 15, and of 7th William 3d, cap. 4, the clergy were bound to establish, but for the maintenance of which no funds had hitherto been provided. A circular notice was therefore issued by the Association, in which they expressed their hope that, by the continuance of parliamentary aid, they should be enabled to assist in the establishment and support of parochial schools, and they stated that they were ready to receive applications from clergymen willing to connect their schools with the Association.

" With respect to the general character of this society, and the leading

principles on which its operations are conducted, it is necessary to observe, that though the object of its members is to promote the religious and moral instruction of all who are disposed to take the benefit of its institutions, their plan is particularly adapted to the instruction of those who belong to the Established Church. This principle was laid down in one of the original resolutions in these terms:—‘ That to guard against the danger of enthusiasm, it be established as a fundamental principle, that nothing be attempted contrary to the doctrine and discipline of the Established Church, or that shall lead in the smallest degree to a separation from the same.’

“ The aid which the Association are willing to give towards the establishment of schools is directed to two objects—building school houses, and granting salaries to teachers. Before any money is granted in aid of building, it is required that a piece of ground should be obtained on a permanent endowment, and vested in the minister and churchwardens for the use of the schools; if a permanent endowment cannot be procured, a lease of a portion of land, of the value of forty shillings per annum, must be obtained. By the terms of the deed of conveyance, the conditions of the grant are declared to be, that the minister of the parish for the time being, shall have the sole power of appointing and of removing the schoolmaster: that the master ‘ shall teach and instruct all such children as shall be named to him for that purpose by the written direction and permission of the said minister, in the principles and practice of reading and writing the English language, and of arithmetic, and to such of them as are members of the Established Church, the church catechism of the Established Church of England, in such mode, and according to such plan of education, and under and subject to such regulations as shall from time to time be in writing ordered by the said minister;’ and that no person shall be allowed to take possession of the premises, &c. without signing a written agreement to quit on the requisition of the minister.

“ The appointment of the schoolmaster is left solely to the clergyman, provided always, that he appoint a member of the Established Church. Of 249 schools now in connection with the Association, the masters of 99 hold also the situation of parish clerks; and we are informed by some of the managers of the Institution, that this union of offices is thought to be advantageous, by increasing the respectability of the individual who holds them.”

From the spirit already evinced in their treatment of the Charter Schools, the reader may form some idea of the feeling with which they must have regarded a society so strictly in connexion with the Church; and therefore there needs but little to be subtracted, on the score of suspicious partiality, from any praise which they have bestowed upon it. The following statement, coming from such a quarter, is very satisfactory.

“ In the course of our inspection, the schools connected with the Association appeared to us generally to be of a very orderly and highly respectable description.”

That the business of education may be, and has been, carried on amongst children professing different creeds, without giving rise to any distrust or jealousy, is thus shown :—

“ We had in the course of our inspection been much struck with the state of many schools, in which the pupils paid for the instruction they received, and in which there appeared to be perfect harmony amongst children of all persuasions. These schools were carried on as objects of private speculation, and not supported either by public funds or by aid of societies. Each child was taught the religion which its parents wished it to learn; and the master, who depended for his livelihood on giving satisfaction to his employers, was content to impart as he could the instruction necessary for each. In this manner we frequently found the same master teaching the catechism of the Church of England to one child, the Roman Catholic to another, and the Presbyterian to a third, according to a mode which is well described to us by Mr. Cooke, the moderator of the Presbyterian Synod of Ulster. Although we do not mean to approve of the same master teaching different and conflicting religious doctrines, the state of these schools led us to the conclusion, that it was at least possible that both religious and general instruction might be communicated in establishments in which children of all persuasions should be taught together.”

It is instructive and interesting to observe the degree in which the Association for discountenancing Vice has succeeded in attracting the attendance of Roman Catholic children, without in the least departing from those principles which keep it in strict connexion with the Church. The following is the unsuspicious testimony of the commissioners :—

“ Though the schools established by the Association have been principally for the education of children of the Established Church, they appear to have been attended almost as numerous by Roman Catholics as by Protestants. Amongst the documents accompanying the General Report, printed by authority of the Association in the year 1820, is a list, dated November, 1819, of the schools at that time receiving their aid, and which contains a statement of the numbers on the roll of each school, distinguishing Protestants from Roman Catholics. By this list it appears that the total number on the Rolls of the 119 schools then connected with the Association, with the exception of five from which there were no returns, was 8,828, and that of this number 4,460 were returned as Protestants, and 4,368 as Roman Catholics.”

While this body appears to have made fewer professions of ultra liberality, it also appears to have better kept its faith with the public, and to have been more ingenuous and tolerant than any of those numerous societies which are at present outbidding each other in their anxiety to impart the blessings of education to the benighted population of Ireland. While the masters have been uniformly members of the Church of England, and while

the catechism of the Church of England has been publicly taught, no undue means have been resorted to in order to unsettle the faith of those professing a different creed; nor has any outcry been raised against the schools as if they were mere traps for converts. The Kildare Street Institution, which, in part, owed its origin, as the commissioners tell us, to a suspicion that the schools of the Association were of "*too Protestant* a character to be generally available for the education of Roman Catholic children," has not been thus successful. Its managers, who pride themselves on being superior to party feelings, have endeavoured, we believe with the best intentions, to become all things to all men. But their system of compromise has been represented, by the Irish Roman Catholic priests, as adopted merely for the purposes of proselytism, and accordingly an outcry has been raised against it from one end of the country to the other, which has exceedingly agitated the public mind, and given rise to much rancorous and uncharitable feeling. It may be that, in the tumult and agitation thus produced, some converts have been made; but, on the whole, the good must be very doubtful, while the evil is certain and alarming.

The gentlemen who conduct the affairs of this society, are, we have every reason to believe, amiable, virtuous, and respectable in a very high degree; but they have, more or less, identified themselves with those who are making the most avowed and aggressive efforts against Popery, and thus become objects of peculiar suspicion and distrust to persons whose interests and prejudices alike conspire to favour the continuance of that superstition in Ireland. Nor are we sure that the best mode of combating the errors of popery consists in exciting a fever in the public mind, and, by exasperating controversy, lashing the populace into madness. It seems to us as clear as any demonstration, that in a country like Ireland, Popery, if left to itself, can co-exist alone with the ignorance and the barbarism out of which it originated; and that in proportion as the people are *properly* educated, they will break the shell within which they are inclosed, and intellectual vigour will give birth to spiritual emancipation. To aim at their conversion prematurely, would be to rip the untimely embryo from the womb, before the functions of life had been sufficiently developed to insure the continuance of its existence. And this is precisely what we apprehend must result from all such efforts as, under the influence of a zeal which is not according to knowledge, seek to superinduce upon the newly awakened and untutored faculties of the Irish peasant, truths which are repugnant to all his prejudices, and more likely to alarm by their novelty than to attract by their importance.

We must not omit to observe that the Kildare Street Society, by their extensive issues of cheap and useful books, have succeeded, to a considerable extent, in supplanting the vicious and demoralizing works which were, down to a very recent period, current amongst the lower Irish. What the society has done in this way is unmixed good, and entitled to unqualified commendation.

The system proposed by the commissioners we subjoin in their own words. It is as follows :—

“ We propose that public schools of general instruction shall be established, one at least in each benefice, in which literary instruction shall be communicated to children of all religious persuasions; that two teachers, to be appointed by the general superintending authority, (the establishment of which we shall subsequently recommend), shall be employed in each school, where the extent of attendance shall be sufficient to justify the expense; that they shall each of them be laymen, and that one of them shall be a Roman Catholic, where any considerable number of Roman Catholics are in attendance on the school; and that a Presbyterian teacher shall be provided in those schools, where the number of children belonging to that communion shall render such appointment necessary or expedient; that on two days in the week the school shall break up at an early hour, and the remainder of the day be devoted to the separate religious instruction of the Protestants, the clergyman of the Established Church attending for the purposes at once of superintendence and assistance, and the Presbyterian minister likewise, if he shall so think fit, for the children of his communion. That on two other days of the week the school rooms of general instruction shall in like manner be set apart for the Roman Catholic children, on which occasions, under the care of a Roman Catholic lay teacher, approved of as mentioned in the minute which we have given, they shall read the epistles and gospels of the week, as therein mentioned, and receive such other religious instruction as their pastors (who may attend if they think fit) shall direct. It may be right to notice, that in the Roman Catholic church there are epistles and gospels appointed, not for Sundays only, but for almost every day in the year, and they comprise altogether a large portion of the Old and New Testament.

“ If the attendance on a school should be so limited as to render both a master and usher unnecessary, the master might be permitted to take charge of the school of general instruction, and be also the religious teacher to the children of the same persuasion as himself. In such a case, however, a person of a different religion, duly qualified and properly remunerated, might attend at those periods in the week when the school is set apart for the religious instruction of children of a different persuasion from the master, and perform, under proper superintendence, the duty of religious teacher to those of his own communion; and it might be possible for the individual appointed to this duty, to take charge of the religious instruction in more schools than one in a parish or district. We suggest this arrangement, however, as one which is

possible rather than desirable; and express our opinion, that the establishment of parochial schools, sufficiently large to occupy a master and usher, is much the most eligible course.

“ For the foundation and management of such schools of general instruction, as we recommend, we think that a distinct board should be appointed by government, of persons responsible for the execution of the duty committed to their charge, and who should be invested with sufficient authority to control the application and expenditure of the public money appropriated to the purposes of general education. The board should, we think, appoint inspectors, who should be enabled to examine upon oath. The schoolmasters, also, we think, should be sworn to conform to the rules laid down by the board for their guidance. It will be necessary for this board to have the entire control of all money to be applied to the maintenance of the schools under their care, from whatever sources it may be derived;—to have a legal right to the school house, either by a permanent grant, in the case of a parochial school, or by possession being transferred to them for a period not less than a year, in the case of a school belonging to a private patron receiving aid from the board. They should have the sole power also of appointing and dismissing all masters and assistants, and of admitting or rejecting all books or papers which may be read in their schools.”

Our views are, we trust, already sufficiently developed to render many observations on this ill-digested proposal unnecessary. Suffice it to say, that it seeks to supersede the functions of the Established Church, and to erect a kind of authority which, if we may judge from the character of the present commission, will be a mixed mode, comprising every species of dissent which is contained under the genus Christianity. In depriving the Protestant clergyman of the right of appointing the parish schoolmaster, it deprives him of all effective superintendence over the school. And in associating with the master an usher of a different persuasion, and not appointed by himself, it establishes the very worst kind of imperium in imperio, and ensures the perpetuation of religious discord. The clergyman of the Established Church is put exactly upon a level with the ministers of dissenting and Roman Catholic congregations, with this difference, that the duty of superintendence, which is left optional with the latter, is made obligatory upon the former. It is thus the commissioners propose to revive into operation the spirit of the enactment of Henry the Eighth, which, as we before observed, contemplated the church in its political as well as its spiritual relation to the state, and recognized it as the only instrument of national moralization! The clergy must hide their diminished heads. They must not give offence to their dissenting brethren, by presuming, in a public school, supported by a parliamentary grant, to instruct in the national creed the children of their own communion!

This is conciliation with a vengeance! A kind of conciliation which would obliterate the peculiar feature by which a national creed should be distinguished, namely, universal, public, authoritative promulgation; and, we hesitate not to say, sacrifices the end in attempting to secure the means of national education. Never was there so perfect an exemplification of grasping at the shadow and losing the substance. One of the best fruits of education should be to inspire the people with a love and veneration for the Established Church, to lead them gradually to appreciate its worth and to imbibe its spirit. And is this to be done by tearing her from her place in the political firmament, where she ought to shine "*ut luna inter minora sidera*"? In an assembly alive to the rights of the clergy, and entertaining a just notion of the position which they should occupy, would such a proposition be, for one moment, endured? But, alas! the church is a widow. She sits alone, *sola secum queri solet*. Every one who goes by may take up his proverb against her. She has no one to meet her enemies in the gate. And hence the ribald insolence with which she is assailed, in the very seat of legislation, by those who are sworn to defend her. And hence the easy familiarity with which proposals are made for the confiscation of her revenues, and the curtailment of her legitimate authority;—as if the church were Naboth, and the state were Ahab, and the levelling members of the House of Commons were ambitious of appearing in the character of Jezabel.

The commissioners talk of the difficulty and the delicacy of the task which was imposed upon them. We must say that the difficulty has arisen, principally, from themselves. They have chosen to occupy themselves in balancing between the pretensions of hostile creeds; and, instead of proceeding directly to establish that system of national education which is wisest and best, and trusting to its intrinsic excellence for ultimate success, they have exhibited a most unstatesmanlike anxiety to accommodate their measures to existing prejudices. Accordingly, by giving satisfaction to no party, they have succeeded in proving, in the most complete manner, that compromise is not conciliation. In truth, we can discover no steady principle whatever by which they were guided in their determinations. Their system is built upon shifting sands. In order to be consistent with itself, it must not merely regard the established church with a contumelious jealousy, it must be as various as are the several complexions of dissent, and as changeful as theameleon. It would be very difficult to assign a sufficient reason why the prejudices of Roman Catholics and Presbyterians should be so far consulted as that ushers of their persuasions should be appointed in the public schools, while the Socinians, the Metho-

dists and the Quakers experience no similar indulgence. But, considering who the majority of the commissioners are, the plan which they have proposed might have been expected.

Upon our principles, how easily is the difficulty removed which they found so formidable. According to our views, government should assume the office, not of local interference, but of general superintendence. The schools to be established by public authority should be under the direction of the established clergy; and while nothing was permitted which could give reasonable ground for offence, they should be distinguished by the public instruction afforded to children professing the national religion, in the doctrine of the Established Church.

There is nothing which requires to be so resolutely guarded against as the insidious encroachments of latitudinarianism under the specious mask of toleration. Toleration, in the proper sense of the word, no doubt, all dissenters should possess. It is not less reconcileable with the wisest policy than consistent with the dictates of Christian charity. And if there were not men in the imperial parliament unprincipled enough in their hostility to our still subsisting institutions, to court the sectaries upon any terms, and to hold the language of disparagement and intimidation to the church, no dissenters could be so unreasonable as to expect more than a perfect impunity in the profession of their respective creeds, and that only so long as they maintained them at their own expense, and in a manner consistent with the safety of the church which is by law established. That the national creed should be professed and taught publicly and by authority, no man in his senses could be bold enough to deny, if he were not ignorant or fanatical in a degree that is alike dangerous and alarming. To such, the constitutional statesman should give place, no, not for a moment. And that any class of his majesty's subjects should be encouraged to hold that creed in such utter scorn as to stipulate for its banishment from public schools as the condition of their adhesion to a system of national education, only proves the extreme to which things have already gone, the degree in which liberality has proceeded to latitudinarianism, and the necessity for making, at length, a strenuous stand against any farther encroachments upon those sacred principles which have cemented, by indissoluble union, the church and state, and which, as long as they are preserved inviolate, guarantee the integrity of the constitution.

We cannot conclude without expressing the satisfaction which we feel at the measures and the conduct of the present chief secretary for Ireland. His administration has been distinguished for good sense, good temper, and sound constitutional principle. The manner in which he has used the extensive church patronage which

he possesses, is above all praise. Upon this subject we are enabled to speak with positive certainty. The individuals, promoted at his recommendation, are all of them men whose talents and piety reflect credit upon their appointments; men, too, whose modest worth never affected the distinction which awaited them, until they were addressed by the single-minded and discriminating secretary with the cheering words, "Friend, come up higher." We do not pledge ourselves to a perfect accordance with every particular measure of the right honourable gentleman's administration. But we should regret that he entertained any distrust of the motives which have actuated us in examining the Report of the education commissioners; as our confidence in his knowledge, judgment, firmness, and integrity is such as gives us complete assurance, that, while he continues at his present post, the machinations of disturbers of the public tranquillity will be vigilantly watched and promptly counteracted; and sacrilegious spoliators, under whatever garb, or with whatever professions they may appear, will be prevented from laying unholy hands on the revenues of the church of Ireland.

A Geographical and Historical Description of Ancient Italy, with a Map, and a Plan of Rome. By the Rev. J. A. Cramer, M. A., late Student of Christ Church. 2 vols. 8vo. Oxford. 1826. 1l. 10s.

THERE are persons in the world, who think it right to condemn every study, which does not produce some tangible and substantial profit: and the question, *cui bono?* is often asked with respect to any pursuit or occupation, which they do not happen themselves to be fond of. Perhaps no one is oftener called upon to answer this question than the lover of antiquities: whether his taste lead him to explore a ruin, or decypher a charter, to speculate upon the existence of Troy, or to illustrate a Pelasgic inscription, his researches are sure to be treated with indifference, if not with ridicule and contempt, by a large portion of mankind. It would not only be foolish, it would be culpable, to justify a love of antiquities, if they so intirely engross a man's mind, as to make him useless in the world and disagreeable in society. When the antiquary neglects all other branches of knowledge, and gives neither pleasure nor profit to others from his own peculiar pursuit, then we may safely say of him that he is an useless animal.

But it is unfair to go beyond this, and to pass a sweeping censure upon antiquarian learning itself. It is evidently the abuse and the excess which in this case are to be blamed: and unless it can be proved, that the study of antiquities is more likely than any other study to engross and monopolize the mind, there is great injustice in condemning it, because some antiquaries are useless beings.

To ask, what is the good of groping amidst broken bricks and stones, is quite as wise as to ask, what is the good of looking at an oiled canvass, or a block of marble; of drawing circles and triangles, or pulling flowers to pieces. In this manner every amusement of science or of taste may be turned into ridicule: and perhaps the remark made above is not far from the truth, that when one man finds fault with the pursuits of another, it is because the latter do not happen to suit his own inclination and his own fancy. There is surely no reason in the nature of things, why a man should not admire a ruined arch as much as a picture or a statue: it may be more fashionable to notice specimens of the fine arts, and antiquaries will never be so numerous as the lovers of statuary and painting: but still we may be justified in saying, that there is something in the recollection of ancient times, which is naturally pleasing to the human mind. This pleasure may be felt, and is undoubtedly felt by many, who, so far from bearing the name of antiquaries, have no taste for antiquities as a peculiar study, and would even condemn it in others: but who would not agree with Johnson, that the man is little to be envied, who does not feel his patriotism warmed on the plains of Marathon? and would not a school-boy, who reads his Homer as a task, and has cried over its perplexing difficulties, yet feel a kind of vexation and disappointment, if he were to be told that such a place as Troy never had an existence? The fact is, that the mind takes delight in retracing any thing that is past; and the reason of this appears to be, that imagination has then full play. It will be allowed, that the associations of ideas, to which antiquities give rise, may in many cases be of great practical benefit; but we venture to assert, that local and historical recollections are universally pleasing, though in a greater or less degree, even when no moral or political speculation arises in the mind.

Whoever has visited Rome in these days of universal travelling, may have seen honest English citizens, with their wives and daughters, gazing at the Forum and the Capitol, and evidently feeling some indescribable inward satisfaction, though, perhaps, before they left England they knew nothing of Rome except that it belonged to the Pope. There might seem at first to be little in common between such travellers and Marius in the ruins of Carthage: but the ideas passing in their minds at the moment are more si-

milar than we should at first think or perhaps wish. On such occasions we have the consciousness that we are standing on the same spot where some great man has stood before; whether this person was Cicero or Catiline, whether it was the best or the worst man of his day, makes no difference at the moment, it is the association of our own present thoughts with days long gone by, which gives satisfaction to the mind; and we contend, that this feeling is as natural, and therefore as much deserving to be encouraged, as any other which is entertained merely as an amusement, and as an accessory to our graver studies.

The book now before us will supply an illustration of these remarks. By some it will be left unopened, as containing nothing useful or profitable; while many will think it highly interesting and amusing. It is perfectly possible to be a good man and a good citizen without knowing the line of demarcation between Lucania and Apulia, or being able to point out the route by which Hannibal crossed the Apennines. All this we are willing to allow, but we deny that an inquiry into the geography of ancient Italy is therefore not to be encouraged. In whatever light we view the history of Italy, whether we look to its former political power or to its spiritual dominion in later times; whether we consider it as the land of patriots and heroes, or as the nurse of poetry and the arts; whether we view it in the splendor of its glory, or prostrate and debased as it is at present, there is a charm in the name of Italy, which few are philosophical enough to resist; and there is surely instruction to be drawn from its history, which no philosophy can present in more strong or lasting colours. We therefore feel, in common with all persons who are interested in such subjects, greatly indebted to Mr. Cramer for his learned and satisfactory investigation into the geography and history of ancient Italy.

The name of this gentleman is already perhaps not unknown to many of our readers. At least, we feel sure, that a *Dissertation on the Passage of Hannibal over the Alps* has given much pleasure and information to all who have read it, though they may not have known what the title-page concealed, that it was written by Mr. Cramer, in conjunction with a friend who travelled with him. We are happy to find, that he has been continuing the same line of study, and that having previously brought Hannibal to the Italian side of the Alps, he did not leave him there among the barbarous Taurini, but has enabled us to trace him in his marches and countermarches through the heart of Italy, and to read our Livy and Polybius with some chance of understanding their conflicting narratives. Mr. Cramer appears to be familiarly acquainted with the historians and geographers of

Greece and Italy, and likewise to have spared no pains in consulting the works of modern Italian antiquaries.

It is, perhaps, not generally known, that the local antiquities of Italy have been explored more in detail, and given rise to more elaborate dissertations, than those of any other country. Few districts, indeed, if any, in Europe, could promise more to repay the researches of the antiquary; and almost every town in Italy, if it has not had its literary society, has at least been explored and illustrated by the zeal of some learned native. When we look to Italy in its present state, where the civil institutions of its divided provinces seem to have damped and almost extinguished every thing great and noble, and where a taste for the fine arts alone flourishes, we should hardly expect that so much had been done to illustrate its general and particular history. And yet the vast collection of Muratori far exceeds any thing which any other country has yet produced; and the names of Maffei, Visconti, with those of several other authors, must always stand pre-eminent in the antiquarian world. We do not mean to speak in commendation of all the writers upon local antiquities which Italy has produced. The theories of many of them are so totally opposed to each other, that some of them must be pronounced fanciful and absurd; and prejudice in favour of his own country, or his own town, which the writer would call patriotism, leads him, perhaps, in many instances, to place the scene of some great event in his own neighbourhood, not because such a conjecture is borne out by facts, but because he and his friends are pleased to think that it was so. Mr. Cramer's criticisms upon the contradictory notions of these writers are generally very judicious; having been in Italy himself, he is better able to understand the descriptions of ancient authors; and an Englishman has an advantage in settling the difficulties of Italian history, because he has no national or local prejudice to warp his decisions.

The map, which accompanies the present work, is also one of the best of the kind which we have ever met with: as a companion to the ancient historians who treat of Italian affairs, it may in future supersede every other: and we cannot help commending it for avoiding, what is frequently the fault of English maps, that great darkness of shade, which being introduced with a view to designate the mountains, has the effect of making more than half the names of places illegible, or extremely difficult to be read. The English maps appear to have carried this custom to the greatest excess: and whoever has travelled in Switzerland cannot have failed to admire the *carte routiere* of Keller, which, though representing the most mountainous district in Europe, gives every other physical feature of the country distinctly, and yet makes the

variations of hill and valley perfectly apparent. In many maps, which we could name, the mountains are evidently drawn, in a great measure, by fancy, and are arranged so as to make a pleasing picture: and as an instance of defect in this way, we will refer our readers to most maps of Italy, where the promontory of Otranto, or what is called the heel of the boot, is represented as divided throughout by a continuous chain of mountains. The truth is, as Mr. Cramer's map exhibits it, that the branch of the Apennines, which strikes eastward toward this promontory, terminates long before it reaches the sea; and the greater part of the peninsula is level country, or diversified with low hills. Virgil, when he describes Æneas as crossing over from Epirus to the opposite coast, unde iter Italianum cursusque brevissimus undis, makes him say Cum procul obscuros colles humilemque videmus Italianam—an expression, which would not be intelligible according to most maps, but which is completely borne out by the real features of the country.

The book now before us will certainly be considered a dry work by many who sit down and read it through: and in some respects it is only a book of reference for persons who are studying the classics. This must necessarily be the case, since it is the object of the work to notice every town and river mentioned by ancient authors: and since, in many of these cases, the name is all that is preserved, or, if the site can be ascertained, there is no historical interest attached to it, many pages are taken up with a mere topographical catalogue. It is satisfactory, however, to have these points finally settled: and there are few readers, who do not feel their satisfaction increased, if they can lay their finger upon a map, and follow the series of events from place to place. It may be added, that the frequent inspection of a map is an important assistant to the memory: and many a person has put the battle of the Trebia before that of the Ticino, because his eye was not familiarized with the relative position of the two rivers.

The historian Livy ought certainly to feel himself indebted to the industry of Mr. Cramer. We do not mean, that he would feel himself much flattered by the mention which is made of him: for the censure, which was passed upon him in the Dissertation upon Hannibal's passage of the Alps, is here continued and supported by such demonstrable arguments, that it is hopeless to acquit him of great ignorance and carelessness. The more the details of history and geography are examined, the more the qualifications of Livy, for an historian (always excepting his elegant and easy style) are likely to be called in question: but there is such confusion, such inconsistencies and contradictions in his narra-

tive, if taken by itself, that the person, who will expose them, and reconcile them with more authentic details, must be considered a signal benefactor to the author. As instances of the happy result of critical discussion, we would refer the reader to p. 54, &c. of vol. i. where the battle of the Ticino is illustrated; and to p. 177, &c., where much light is thrown upon the route, by which Hannibal marched from Cisalpine Gaul into Etruria. As Mr. Cramer observes, there would be no difficulty in deciding the latter point, if we had no other account but that of Polybius. It is the narrative of Livy which it is impossible to reconcile with other historians, or with the country itself: and his mistake in placing the marshes, which annoyed Hannibal, to the south of the Apennines instead of to the north, is the more remarkable, because in travelling from Padua to Rome he went partly in the same direction: and his curiosity must have been surprisingly small, if he did not turn out of his way even once to trace the actual line which Hannibal had taken. Literature has perhaps sustained no severer loss than in the thirty-five last books of Polybius, of which we have nothing remaining but a few detached fragments. His vulgar Megalopolitan Greek, as Lord Monboddo styles it, is certainly anything but agreeable: but if a philosophical mind and careful investigation ever qualified a man for writing a history of his own times, the lost books of Polybius must have contained a treasure, which would be worth all the 145 books of Livy, if they had all come down to us. No man in those days would have made a tour in the Alps for the mere purpose of ascertaining the passage of Hannibal, if he had not felt the full necessity of accuracy, even in the minute points of history: and we fully agree with Mr. Cramer, that wherever the accounts of Polybius and Livy are at variance, it is much the safest course, in the absence of any other testimony, always to adhere to Polybius.

We must now call the attention of our readers to a portion of the work before us, which involves much deeper points of consideration than the manœuvres of contending armies, or the situation of an ancient town. Mr. Cramer's *Dissertations* are historical as well as geographical: and those persons, who see nothing in a catalogue of towns and rivers but a dry matter of reference, will perhaps take more interest in the question of the early colonization of Italy. This is undoubtedly the most interesting portion of the work, though perhaps the topographical investigations require more labour and patience of research. We do not agree with Mr. Cramer in some of his conclusions: nor indeed have we met with any theory upon this subject which is altogether satisfactory: but so many facts are brought together in the course of the two

volumes, and there is so much judicious reflection upon the opinions which have been advanced, that we cannot resist entering at some length into this interesting and obscure subject.

When considering the quarter from whence Italy was peopled, we are necessarily led into the more extended inquiry as to the different tribes which have successively peopled Europe. Upon this subject we have met with no system which seems more plausible, and more borne out by existing documents, than that which antiquaries of later years have generally adopted, that Europe has been peopled by three great streams from the East, the Celts, the Goths, or Teutones, and the Sarmatians, who followed each other in the order in which they are here mentioned. The Celts undoubtedly occupied France and Spain at the earliest periods of which we have any accounts: and we, therefore, are obliged to believe that no other tribes entered Europe before them. They appear to have travelled westward, or to have been driven on in that direction by succeeding hordes, till they reached the sea and could go no farther. The Gothic, Teutonic, or German tribes, still continue to occupy the central regions of Europe, and from the causes, just mentioned, they have not materially changed their quarters since the time of Tacitus. Having pushed the Celts across the Rhine, they followed them no farther. The country to the west was already occupied: and with the exception of a few attempts to settle in Gaul, which made no lasting impression, they appear to have sent off their exuberant population in a northern direction. The Sarmatian, or Slavonic tribes, were evidently later than the Celts or Goths in Europe; and Bohemia and Moravia, where the language is still spoken, may mark the farthest extent, to which they travelled toward the west.

This threefold migration, in the order of succession here observed, will sufficiently account for the peopling of Spain, France, Germany, and the north and east of Europe. It is notorious that dialects of the Celtic were spoken in Spain, Gaul, and the British isles; and that the nations to the east of the Rhine spoke a different language, which was called German or Teutonic. When we look, however, at the two eastern peninsulas of Europe, Italy and Greece, the theory just mentioned does not appear, at first sight, so obvious or so satisfactory. The languages of Italy and Greece cannot be said, in their bases, to be either Celtic or Teutonic. That the Latin and the *Æolic* have a close resemblance to each other, needs no demonstration; but when we compare them with the dialects of the west of Europe; they appear in some respects to stand alone: and if affinity of language is to be our guide, we must trace the colonization of these two countries from some other quarter than from the Celtic or Teutonic tribes.

The Slavonic nations being the last which entered Europe, are evidently excluded from having furnished the first settlers in Italy or Greece.

Among the French antiquaries Freret and Pelloutier, and among the Italians Bardelli and Durandi, have written learnedly to prove, that the first people of Italy were Celts. Cluverius, Maffei, and Mazzochi, are not disposed to agree with this hypothesis, and Mr. Cramer evidently does not, on the whole, believe in it. We are rather surprised to meet with expressions in his book, which would seem to confound the Celts with the Teutones; whereas, notwithstanding some coincidences in manners and rites, they are clearly of a different origin. Their languages are radically dissimilar; the marked peculiarity of their hair and eyes, which Tacitus observed, might alone serve to distinguish them: and the relative position of the two people, as well as the history of their wars, shew, as was observed above, that the Celts preceded the Teutones in forming a settlement in Europe. Upon the whole we can see no reason to give up the theory which we have long entertained, that Italy was first peopled by Celtic tribes. If what has been said of the Celts being the first settlers in Europe be true, we should naturally expect that they were also the first to enter Italy. The Germans may have followed them into that country, but the Celts would have led the way: and there are perhaps strong reasons to induce us to believe that this was actually the case. In the first place, the notion was not without supporters in ancient times. Solinus and Servius both preserve traditions, that the Umbri were of the same race with the ancient Gauls. (vol. i. p. 252.) It has often been observed, that the names of mountains and rivers in Italy, particularly in the northern parts, are of Celtic derivation: and the widely extended term *Apennine* is evidently connected with *Pen*, a head or eminence.

One of the most important means for deciding questions of this nature is found in the analogy of languages; but it is a subject which, at the same time, is involved in great difficulties, and frequently leads to fanciful and unfounded hypotheses. If we say that the first inhabitants of Italy were Celts, we should certainly be called upon to shew that the language spoken in Italy bore an affinity to the Celtic. Mr. Cramer and other antiquaries dwell much upon the fact of the small resemblance which the Celtic has either to the Latin or the ancient Etruscan; and hence they conclude, that the theory of the Celtic colonization of Italy cannot be maintained. But if the Celts who first entered Italy were followed by settlers of a totally different race, and if these, as we shall shew presently, were more advanced in civiliza-

tion than the people whom they already found there, it is highly probable that the language, which was the result of this intermixture, would partake more of the latter colonists, and retain but little of the ruder Celtic. That this is not mere conjecture may be proved by a reference to our own country. Of all the heterogeneous elements which compose modern English, it is notorious, that a very small proportion of words are British or Welsh; and yet how erroneously would Cluverius or Mr. Cramer conclude from this, that England was not first peopled by Celts? Now we imagine that the very same effect was produced in Italy which happened here. The Romans conquered the Britons, and the Latin language was diffused over great part of the island: when the Romanized Britons became too weak to resist their Saxon invaders, the language was remoulded into a German cast; and when the Normans got possession of the throne, though, numerically, they were but few, yet, from being more polished and having the government in their hands, they infused a great portion of French into the language; and, without taking notice of the Celtic or the Latin, it may be said, that the genius of the language is essentially German, with the addition of a large vocabulary of Norman terms. So uncertain and delusive a science is etymology; and so difficult is it to trace the first settlers in any country by observing its language at any given period. Still, however, a considerable resemblance has been pointed out between the Latin and Celtic languages;* greater, perhaps, than what Mr. Cramer is aware of; and it may be observed, that in many instances where the Latin terms have no affinity with the Greek, they bear a close resemblance to the Celtic. This we conceive to be an important fact; and when Mr. Cramer says, "that as the Greek language in its most ancient form appears to enter largely not only into the composition of the Latin language, but also into that of the other Italian dialects, the first settlers of Italy and those of Greece were of the same race," we cannot allow his conclusion. A resemblance between Greek and Latin no more proves that the *first settlers* of the two countries were of the same race, than the resemblance between French and English would prove, that the Normans were the first settlers or first invaders of Britain.

Our theory then is this: we conceive, that Italy was first peopled by land and from the north by a tribe of Celts; that these settlers, as their numbers multiplied, extended their journeyings toward the south; and that at a very early period another nation, of a totally different origin and language, came from the east by sea, and formed settlements on various parts of the coast.

* See the Classical Journal, vol. iii. p. 121.

This maritime people we conceive to be the Pelasgi; and we cannot express our approbation too strongly of Mr. Cramer's ingenious conjecture that the Pelasgi and the Tyrrheni were the same. This remark, which clears up so many difficulties, has been almost totally disregarded by modern writers; though some of the ancient historians, as noticed by Mr. Cramer, had evidently heard the notion discussed. Every circumstance which we read of the Tyrrheni and the Pelasgi coincides; they are spoken of as occupying the same districts; they had each the same migratory habits, and the same fondness for piratical excursions; and what one writer says of the Pelasgi as settling in Italy, another mentions in almost the same terms, calling them Tyrrheni. We thus get rid at once of the improbable story of the Tyrrhenians being a body of Lydians who sailed for Italy; though the basis of the fable may have more truth than Mr. Cramer seems willing to allow: and if the Pelasgi came from the east, as all history and tradition makes them to have done, it is very possible, that a body of them, who had once inhabited Lydia, moved afterwards into Italy.

The question as to the date of the first Pelasgic or Tyrrhenian migration into Italy is a very difficult one. We have said, that we conceive the Celts to be the first people who entered Italy, and that the Pelasgic settlements on the coast were of a later date. We do not, however, mean to adhere rigorously to this precedence. We think it probable, that this was the case: but we hear of the Pelasgi in Greece at a very early period: and if the Chronicle of Eusebius may be depended upon, which makes the Pelasgic kingdom of Sicyon to have been established A. C. 2089, it is possible, that in some of their maritime expeditions they may have visited Italy not long after the Celts had arrived there, or even before. What we wish to assert is, that the great mass of the Italian population in early times was Celtic, and that the Pelasgi and the Celts were of a totally different origin.

One of the most interesting speculations, but at the same time the most difficult, connected with the history of man, is that which concerns the origin of nations and the diversity of languages. We do not mean to enter into the discussion, whether the confusion of tongues at Babel is to be understood of the creation of certain new languages, or whether the differences which now exist have grown up in the lapse of ages, and been the gradual effect of separation. Arguments might not be wanting to lead us to the former notion. It is true, that the differences between the Celtic dialects and those of China might be caused by different hordes going off in an easterly and a westerly direction, and never having any intercourse afterwards: but when we

find such a striking difference between the languages of the Celtic and Teutonic nations, the latter of whom followed close upon the former, without any other people intervening, the same theory does not appear adequate to explain the fact. We might be prepared, however, for great dissimilarity of language between the Celtic and the Pelasgi, if we imagine, as seems to be the case, that the former entered Europe by passing to the north of the Euxine, while the latter went by the south of it. If this were so, many ages would roll away before the two tribes, originally of the same family, came again into contact; and it is not improbable to suppose, that this meeting would first be brought about in Italy.

Without pretending to settle minute details, we may conclude, that the confusion of tongues took place somewhere in the plains watered by the Euphrates. It was here that the great hive of mankind was gathered together: and it was from hence, as from a common centre, that they sent out swarms in various directions. It was generally imagined, that the Celts were the same people who were more anciently called Cimmerians, and that they were descended from Gomer, the son of Japheth. There is certainly some resemblance in the name; and it is not undeserving of remark, that the Cimmerii mentioned by Homer (Od. A. 14.) are supposed by some commentators to have been seated on the western coast of Italy. This we do not believe to be correct; but it is unquestionable that Homer understood by the Cimmerii a people who inhabited the western part of Europe. These Gomerians, Cimmerians, or Celts, we imagine to have left the plains of Shinar, in a northerly direction. Uncivilized tribes, whose only occupation is to provide themselves with food, would not be likely to cross any large river, till their increasing numbers compelled them to seek for room: still less would they have the desire or the means to venture across any portion of the sea: but if we inspect a map, it will appear less difficult for them to have crossed the Straits of Caffa, or Cimmerian Bosphorus, than to have surmounted the successive obstacles which met them to the north. That the Cimmerians did cross these straits, we have undeniable evidence: the *Cimmerian Bosphorus* and *Cimmerian Chersonese* attest the fact, and to this day the name of *Crimea* preserves a trace of its ancient inhabitants. Herodotus informs us, that the Cimmerians were the original inhabitants of what was afterwards called Scythia: (which confirms, by the way, the relative order of migration of the Celtic and Scythian or German tribes:) and in this direction we may suppose that they penetrated farther and farther into Europe, till they finally reached the ocean in Gaul and Spain. There is no evidence that any Celtic tribes ever settled in Greece, and the physical features of Europe will

explain the reason. These roaming hordes, who were only travelling in search of a fertile country, would not be tempted to cross the Danube, which, for several hundred miles from its mouth, is broad and rapid; or if they did, the Thracian mountains would deter them from penetrating farther to the south. Thus the Celtic tribes would never have descended into Greece; and having arrived at the top of the Adriatic, they would gradually pass through the defiles of the Julian Alps, and by the valley of the Adige into Italy. We again refer our readers to a map of Europe, and it will appear highly probable, that a stream of people, flowing from the east, would enter Italy from the north, without having descended into Greece.

That Italy was first peopled from the north-east, rather than from the north-west, seems probable *a priori*, though we cannot bring much evidence to prove that it was so. Mr. Cramer, however, who thinks (erroneously in our opinion,) that Italy was peopled from Greece, brings these settlers along the shores of Epirus and Illyrium, and so by the head of the Adriatic into Italy. He probably saw reason to conclude, that the first inhabitants, from whatever quarter they came, entered the peninsula in that direction; and in this respect we perfectly agree with him, though we believe, as stated above, that this migration from the north-east was not of Grecian, but of Celtic tribes. When the Celts, who were gradually advancing westward, became entangled in the Alpine regions of Switzerland, some straggling members of their body would naturally explore the defiles of the mountains, and thus descend into the plains of Lombardy by the numerous passes which now form the communication between the two countries. Here also we are happy to find Mr. Cramer agreeing with us; and in speaking of the Sicani, Siculi, and Ligures, who came from the west, he deduces them all from a Celtic stock. This is granting nearly all that we desire. He thinks, indeed, that the Umbri were the most ancient inhabitants, and these he does not suppose to have been a race of Celts. We think it probable that they were; and in assigning the relative antiquity of the colonists from the north-east, and those from the north-west, we should be disposed not to make any great difference between them. If the Sicani were settled in Sicily, as Thucydides asserts, before the Siculi, we must naturally conclude that they entered Italy before them, and that the former were gradually pushed southward by the latter. Thucydides indeed adds, that the Sicani came from Iberia, having being driven out thence by the Ligures; and in this he is generally supposed to mean, that the Sicani came from Spain. This retrograde movement, at such an early period, would certainly be a perplexing phenomenon: but,

perhaps, in assuming Iberia to mean Spain, the geographers have decided hastily. In the little intercourse which there was between Greece and the west of Europe, it is probable that great inaccuracy would exist as to the names of places, and the roving tribes would themselves give the same name to the different countries which they successively occupied. Thus we know that Italy in early times was called Hesperia, till a more western country than this was discovered, and the name of Hesperia was transferred to Spain. So also Iberia, the name by which the Greeks in later times undoubtedly designated Spain, may have been applied in earlier ages to a country much more to the east, or indeed to many countries; and it was not till they arrived at the ocean, and could proceed no farther, that the name acquired a fixed and settled application. Be this as it may, it seems probable that the Sicani, Ligures, and Siculi, entered Italy in the order here mentioned; that they were Celtic tribes, who came from the north or north-west, and that they gradually descended through the whole of Italy, and the first and last of them passed over into Sicily.

We may mention by the way that the different names of barbarous tribes are very likely to mislead geographers. Many persons seem to imagine, and Mr. Cramer is not altogether free from this notion, that when we read of Umbri, Siculi, Sicani, &c. these people must be actually different nations, and must have come from different quarters. This we conceive to be a mistaken assumption. In the first place, when migratory hordes are *in transitu*, and taking possession of a new country, they would hardly have any name at all; they would not want to speak of themselves collectively; and they must come into contact with some other nation, before they would be distinguished by a particular name. We may imagine, however, when any portion of them became stationary, as they would in a mountainous country, that the inhabitants of one valley might speak of their neighbours under some collective title: and thus, when the Celts entered Italy, by different defiles of the Alps, they would carry with them different names; and if they continued distinct, the name would continue also. But it is obvious that in such cases a diversity of name is not the smallest proof of a diversity of origin; nor have we any more reason to conclude that the Umbri, Sicani, and Siculi, were a different people, than that the Brigantes, Silures, and Ordovices, who inhabited different parts of Britain, were distinct in their origin. We may add that the same name might be borne successively by different tribes; and that the name might in fact be imposed upon the country rather than upon the people: thus, for instance, the people who lived at the top of the Gulf of Ge-

noa, were called *Ligures*: but if the first tribes who bore this name passed on toward the south, the neighbours, who were either not aware of the change, or not interested in it, might still apply the same term *Ligures* to the next occupiers of the same district; and this may account for the confusion made in names of countries by the Grecian geographers. We repeat, however, that the existence of a diversity of appellation is no proof that the occupiers of Italy were not all of one common stock. This conclusion could only be drawn from a diversity of language: national features, under certain circumstances, are not an unsafe test; but since we cannot pretend to tell at the present day whether the *Umbri* and the *Siculi* were similar or dissimilar in the colour of their hair, and the contour of their nose or chin, we can only judge of them by their language; and Mr. Cramer's own work will supply the proof, that there was no radical difference in any of the dialects of ancient Italy. At least we have met with only one exception to this fact, and that perhaps is misrepresented by Mr. Cramer. He is undoubtedly right in observing, that the *Veneti* were the last people who penetrated into Italy by that frontier; (vol. i. p. 112.) but he quotes Polybius as saying, that the *Veneti* differed in language from the Gauls, whence he concludes that they came from a different stock. The expression of Polybius is, γλώττη ἀλλόια χρώμενοι (ii. 17.), which perhaps may not mark a greater difference than what we know to exist between the dialects of the Celtic in Wales and Scotland; and we may remember, that Polybius was comparing the language of the *Veneti* with that of the Gauls who then lived in Lombardy, and whose ancestors had probably poured into Europe many centuries before the recent colony of the *Veneti*. Polybius himself says, that they resembled the Gauls in dress and manner; and Strabo gives it as his own opinion, that they were Gauls. We therefore see no reason for mistrusting the conclusion to which we came above, that Italy was first peopled by Celtic tribes from the north.

As to which of the numerous people were entitled to be called *Aborigines*, we confess that it appears to us an unimportant question. Some modern writers have discussed it with as much earnestness, as if they had been anxious to make out the claim of the ancient Athenians, and to prove that some one tribe had sprung out of the earth, or descended from the clouds. When we speak of the *Aborigines* of Italy, we of course mean the people who first inhabited it; and when Mr. Cramer says that the *Umbri* appear to him to have the best claim to the title of its aboriginal inhabitants, (vol. i. p. 14.) we are not disposed to differ from him; but at the same time, from the mountainous nature of its northern frontier, it is probable that the first settlers came in

many and nearly simultaneous bodies, and that several hordes would be united, before a political power of any importance would be established.

We must now proceed to consider whether any settlements were formed in Italy by people of a totally different origin from the Celts. Mr. Cramer is evidently of opinion, as we have stated already, that the first inhabitants came from the east; by which he means, that they were of the same race with the people who first settled in Greece. With this position we cannot agree. We conceive that two nations, from totally different stocks, formed the earliest settlements in Italy, the Celts and the Pelasgi. Having given our opinion concerning the Celtic migrations, we may now discuss those of the Pelasgi. We must again call the attention of the reader to the ingenious hypothesis of Mr. Cramer, that the Tyrrheni and Pelasgi are to be considered the same. Ancient writers have preserved accounts of very early settlements being made in Italy by people under both of these names; and we repeat that we do not pretend to settle the question, whether the Celts from the north, or the Tyrrheni from the east, were the first to set foot in Italy. We are rather inclined, however, to give precedence to the former. Antiquaries have endeavoured to trace the Pelasgi from Peleg, the descendant of Shem, in the same manner as they have deduced the Celts or Cimmerians from Gomer the son of Japheth. However this may be, there is certainly evidence to show, that the Pelasgi reached Europe by the south coast of the Euxine, passing through Asia Minor. They are stated from the first to have been of a wandering turn, and to have been addicted to expeditions by sea. That this latter circumstance should exist in the Pelasgic, rather than in the Celtic tribes, will appear extremely probable, if we consider the directions in which the two families proceeded. The Celts, as soon as they were got to the west of the Euxine, would never have a sight of the sea till they reached the western extremity of Europe; but if we suppose the descendants of Peleg to have left the plain of Shinar at the same time with the children of Gomer, they would naturally reach the coasts of the Mediterranean in a third of the time which would be necessary to bring the Gomerians to the coast of the Atlantic. Here the same cause, which led the Gomerians to extend themselves progressively in a western direction, would oblige the Pelasgi to betake themselves to the sea. Their numbers were increasing, and they were arrived at the end of their continent; they had therefore nothing to do but to spread themselves along the coast of Asia Minor, and to send off colonies by sea. The narrow straits of the Hellespont would not be difficult to cross, even without the aid of ships; and several of the islands of the Ægean

were within sight of the shore. Accordingly we find that Lemnos and Imbrius were colonized by the Pelasgi in very early times; and Diodorus Siculus tells us, that the ancient name of Lesbos was Pelasgia. Hence they seem to have sent out expeditions for colonization or piracy into various countries of Greece. Part of Thessaly was called Pelasgia, and the Pelasgic wall of Athens is well known to the classical reader. We may suppose the Pelasgic settlements in Thessaly to have been previous to the Trojan war, because Homer recognizes the name; but he also mentions the Pelasgi as a separate people, who lived in the neighbourhood of Caria, which confirms what was said above, that the Pelasgi, in their journey westward, traversed Asia Minor. It seems not improbable that the ancient inhabitants of Caria were themselves Pelasgi: at least we know from Thucydides, that the Carians had a naval force in the earliest periods of Grecian history, and Minos is said to have collected a navy which defeated them.

We should be inclined to ascribe the maritime expeditions of the Pelasgi to a very remote period of antiquity. Perhaps many of the stories, which the early poets preserved of the fabulous ages before the records of authentic history began, may be traced to these wandering voyages of the Pelasgi. If any of them returned back to the quarter from whence they set out, they would naturally recount the wonders which they had seen; and it is not unnatural, that these wonders should be exaggerated. The poets also would not neglect such valuable supplies; and without adhering to unities of time and place, they might bring together the stories which were related by many different parties, and work them into an entertaining whole. The Argonautic expedition may have been one of these poetical romances; the basis of which was a scattered collection of truths cemented together by the imagination of the compiler. This curious fable had evidently many variations; or, as we should say now, it went through many editions. At first, it was confined to a voyage from Thessaly to Colchos on the Euxine: and we may observe by the way, that Thessaly is known to have been the first and principal settlement of the Pelasgi in Greece. Succeeding poets appear to have vied with each other in their marvellous additions to this voyage; and the best way of accounting for the extraordinary route, by which the Argonauts were made to return to their country, is to suppose, that the wonders of different travellers were also woven together without any regard to the connexion or probability of events. According to some, the ship *Argo* was carried over land and launched at the top of the Adriatic; and such a story is so wild and extravagant, that it could only have been added with a view to introduce the adventures of some persons, who had returned from Italy soon after the discovery of the country.

It has been a frequent attempt of commentators to settle the geographical descriptions given by Homer; and among other disputes it has been questioned, whether Ulysses is represented as visiting Italy. Mr. Cramer is evidently inclined not to attach much credit to the critics, who have identified the names of places in the Odyssey with certain parts of Italy. But he surely goes too far, when he hints that Homer describes places which never had an actual existence. We would rather imagine, as observed above, that in common with his brother poets he led his hero an imaginary voyage, but introduced into his narrative the accounts which he had actually received from different travellers. It does not follow, that Homer himself had any definite notion of the situation or relative distances of the places which he names: as far as he was able he probably adhered to truth: but his main object was to make Ulysses meet with all the perils and dangers, and to visit all the strange places, of which he had received any account. It is useless, therefore, to attempt to reconcile all his statements; and we will undertake to say, that it never can be done. Thus, when Homèr mentions the Cimmerii, it is very possible that he had no notion of their geographical position; but it can hardly be doubted, that he had heard of such people somewhere: and it seems almost certain, that they were not in Italy. For when he first mentions them, he says (A. 13.) that they were *near to the ocean*: and shortly after he makes such an evident distinction between the ocean and the sea (M. 1, 2.) that according to Homer they should rather be placed in Spain. The Pillars of Hercules or Straits of Gibraltar were undoubtedly known in Homer's days, though perhaps only to a few: and such a long voyage would naturally be embellished with many marvellous adventures.

Whether we are to understand Sicily by the country of the Cyclops, is a more difficult question. It is most probable, that we should be right in doing so, because all later writers placed the Cyclops in that country. Homer, however, seems only to have heard of the people, and to have known nothing of their relative situation. He at least makes use of no description, which might not apply to any other country as well as Sicily. All that we have to guide us is, that from the Malean promontory to the land of the Lotophagi, was a voyage of nine days, during which time the wind was blowing a gale; and from the Lotophagi to the Cyclops was apparently a short distance. There can be no question but that the Cyclops, according to Homer's notion of them, were a barbarous people. They, at least, could have no affinity with any Grecian stock, and they appear evidently to have occupied their country before any ships touched there from Greece or Asia. We conceive them to have been the Celtic

Aborigines. Homer expressly says that they had no ships, which would be rather singular, if we believe them to be islanders: but the fact is in accordance with what we know of Celtic customs. Their country was extremely fertile, and corn and vines are mentioned among its productions. The people lived in caves on the tops of high hills: and in Sir R. C. Hoare's account of Sicily there is the following passage:—"The singularity of the valley consists in the traces it displays of the habitations of a numerous people, whose era, and even whose very existence, has escaped the attention of history. These dwellings form different stories, excavated in the rocks on each side the valley; some at so considerable a height as to be accessible only by ladders, or by a connexion with the lower story."—(p. 66.) This furnishes a close illustration of Homer's expression,

'Αλλ' οἷγ' ὑψηλῶν ὀρέων ναίουσι κάρηνα,
'Εν σπέσσι γλαφύροισι . . . (I. 113.)

and inclines us to think that the people whom Homer calls Cyclops, lived in Sicily. It seems that Telemus, the son of Eurymus, had visited them before Ulysses, (I. 509): and though the voyage of Ulysses was a fable, we may safely believe that Telemus was a real character, who had actually visited the country; and Homer may have taken this opportunity of introducing the name of one of his own friends into his poem. In another place (A. 106), he mentions the island Trinacria; but there is nothing to show the identity of that country with what he had before named as the land of the Cyclops. But it is time that we should leave Homer's Sinbad, and return to the Pelasgi or Tyrrheni.

We have said that they appear to have visited Italy in very early times: and we should be inclined to think that they went invariably by sea. Freret would wish to prove that they reached Italy by land; but Mr. Cramer well observes, that they "were unquestionably a maritime people; and their first settlements Hadria, Spina, and Ravenna, were seaport towns." Few events in history are more remarkable than the rapid progress which the Tyrrheni made in Italy; and nothing shows more forcibly the advantage which civilization possesses over numbers and more ancient possession. The Umbri and Siculi appear to have been the most powerful of the Celtic inhabitants: and we copy the following passage from Mr. Cramer's work, which excellently describes the manner in which a few Pelasgic adventurers successively spread themselves over the fairest part of Italy.

"They gradually advanced from the Po, into the country of the Umbri, who, being then at war with the Siculi, gladly received their assistance, and after the expulsion of the enemy, gave them settlements and lands in the newly-acquired territory, which was Etruria Proper. In

the history of these events I adhere chiefly to the authority of Philistus, the Sicilian historian, who makes the Siculi of Ligurian origin ; and states that the people who expelled them were the Umbri and the Pelasgi, that being the most rational and intelligible account of this very early revolution. According to the same historian, the migration of the Siculi took place about eighty years before the siege of Troy, which agrees nearly with the date assigned to the same event by Hellanicus, so that we shall not be very far from the mark in assigning the date of about one hundred years before the Trojan war, to the settlement of the Tyrrheni Pelasgi in Etruria. Here, then, they founded, with the assistance of the natives, their first twelve cities ; and if we conceive this people bringing with them all the improvements in war, navigation, and general civilization, which Greece was then beginning to derive from her proximity to the East and to Egypt, into a country only inhabited, and that partially, by rude and savage clans, we shall easily form an idea of the great and rapid influence which they would exercise over the moral and political state of Italy. We must suppose them to have been joined, from time to time, by numerous bands of Pelasgi, adventurers like themselves, as Ephorus represented them, who would flock from different parts of Greece to any country where renown and profit were to be acquired. The Tyrrhenian pirates, who had hitherto infested the *Ægean*, would naturally retire, when that sea was protected by the navy of Minos, to the seas of Italy, to exercise there the habits which they had acquired from the Phœnicians, and which remained so long a characteristic of their nation. We learn from Strabo, that the Greeks did not venture to send colonies into Sicily till long after the fall of Troy, owing to the dread inspired by those formidable depredators. From the tradition preserved by Lycophron, it would appear that they formed settlements on almost every part of the coast washed by the Tyrrhenian sea. Their colonies in Campania and in Lucania, where Pæstum is supposed to have been first founded by them, as well as others on the shores of the Adriatic, also sufficiently attest their busy and enterprising spirit. They seem in fact to have spread themselves over all Italy, and in that sense we may perhaps take the assertion of Livy to be true, that the Tuscan name had reached every part of the peninsula and its seas before the arrival of *Æneas*. But it was in Etruria, properly so called, that the Tyrrheni laid the first foundation of this power, and established under Tarchon their leader, a confederacy of twelve cities.”—(Vol. i. p. 163, &c.)

The whole of this extract so entirely agrees with our own theory as to the population of Italy, that we wonder Mr. Cramer should not more decidedly have drawn the conclusion, that its first inhabitants were Celts. The resemblance which the Etruscan and Latin languages bear to the Greek, would not at all lead us to agree with Mr. Cramer in thinking that the first inhabitants were of a Grecian stock. We have already said, that a civilized people will always impress its language upon one which is more barbarous, if the two become blended together : and there is a fact mentioned by Pliny and Victorinus, which we believe is not

alluded to in Mr. Cramer's book; this is, that the Pelasgi, under the guidance of Hercules, introduced letters into Latium. Whoever we are to suppose this Hercules to have been, we have here an acknowledged tradition that letters were introduced by the Pelasgi; and every one who has investigated the subject must have observed that the Latin language resembles the Æolic more than any other Grecian dialect; and the Æolic is known to be the oldest form of the Greek language. It may be added that the ancient Etruscans wrote from right to left, and the old Pelasgic inscriptions are also written in the same way. These facts may be brought to prove that the inhabitants of Italy learned much from the Greeks: but we repeat that the whole course of ancient history leads us to conclude, that the first and original settlers were of a totally different stock.

When it is said that the Pelasgi carried letters into Italy, this must not be understood of the first comers; for there is every reason to think that the Pelasgi themselves learned the use of letters from the Phœnicians: and Cadmus, who had the honour of importing this improvement into Greece, did not arrive there till regular settlements had been made in many parts of the country. It must, therefore, have been sometime subsequent to Cadmus, that the use of letters was carried into Italy. The Phœnicians themselves may perhaps have visited the Italian coasts in ancient times: and some of the early traces of civilization, which we meet in that country, may have been owing to Phœnician rather than to Pelasgic arrivals. The Egyptians may also have contributed their share in introducing some improvements. Diodorus Siculus has observed, that Egypt sent many colonies into different parts: and, according to Eusebius, a distinct work was written upon this subject by Ister, an inhabitant of Alexandria. But of these Egyptian colonies little or nothing is known. History has preserved the names of Cecrops, Erichonius, Danaus, and others, who undoubtedly went from that country into Greece: and it is the opinion of Shuckford, that they arrived there long before the time of Moses, when Egypt was suffering great tyranny and oppression from the new dynasty of shepherd kings. He supposes that it was this oppression which caused so many persons to quit their country about the same time and seek for settlements in foreign parts; and if large numbers migrated, it is not improbable that some of them might settle in Italy. But upon this, as observed above, neither history nor tradition have preserved any details. The fact is certainly not improbable, and we should rejoice if Mr. Cramer could throw any light upon so obscure a subject.

We have seen that the Tuscan power grew up by the union of

the Tyrrheni with the Umbri, or whoever else were the first inhabitants of the central parts of Italy. The Greeks, as might be expected, continued to speak of this powerful people under the name of Tyrrheni; but the Romans, from some cause with which we are not acquainted, spoke of them under the appellation of Etrusci or Tusci. The history of the Tuscans, if we had materials from which it might be composed, would be extremely interesting. It would carry us back into times long antecedent to the reputed foundation of Rome, and would exhibit to us that ancient people, powerful by land and sea, with the arts and sciences flourishing among them. We should find them decidedly the leading power in the west of Europe, and constantly coming into contact with the formidable navy of Carthage. Mr. Cramer in a few words describes the decline and ruin of their political consequence.

“Had the Tuscans formed a regular and effective plan for securing their conquests and strengthening their confederacies, they would have been the masters of Italy, and perhaps of the world, instead of the Romans. But their enterprises, after a certain period, seem to have been desultory, and their measures ill combined and ineffectual. A fatal want of internal union which prevailed amongst their states, as Strabo judiciously observes, rendered them an easy conquest to their Gallic invaders in the north of Italy, and to the hardy Samnites in Campania; while Rome was aiming at the very centre of their power and existence those persevering and systematic attacks, which with her were never known to fail. The history of the Tuscans, subsequently to the foundation of Rome, is to be gleaned from Livy, and at intervals from short detached notices in the Greek historians and poets: but a rich field is left open to the antiquary, who would illustrate the annals of this interesting people from the monuments that are daily discovered in their country, which seems destined to be the seat of the arts and of good taste through a perpetuity of ages.”—(Vol. i. p. 169, 170.)

The early history of Rome is involved in still greater obscurity than that of the Tuscans. The Roman antiquaries themselves disputed as to the date of its foundation, and nothing certain was agreed among them. But this is a minor point, compared with the questions which have been agitated in modern times. It has always been thought doubtful whether much authority should be attached to the history of Rome, previous to the burning of the city by the Gauls, when, as Livy himself tells us, all the records were destroyed. But some later writers have endeavoured to convince us, that the whole of the early Roman history is altogether a fable. Upon the subject of this historical scepticism, Mr. Cramér has some very judicious remarks at vol. i. p. 347.

“Let us retrench, if it must be so, the gaudy decorations and fanciful ornaments with which these historians have embellished their work,

but let us not at the same time overthrow the whole fabric. We may prune what is exuberant or decayed, and weed what is rank and unprofitable; but we must beware, in the process, of encroaching upon what is sound, or rooting out what is wholesome and nutritious. Let it be granted that the rape of the Sabine women is a fiction, it may still be true that Tatius and his Curetes were once masters of Rome. Though it be uncertain with respect to the Horatii and Curiatii, which belonged to Rome, and which to Alba, we may still believe that the latter city sank beneath its more powerful rival. The elder Tarquin's reign does not cease to be an historical fact, because we hear an absurd story of an eagle uncovering his head on his arrival at the gates of Rome. The constitution, said to have been framed by Servius Tullius, may have been the result of longer experience and more practical wisdom than falls to the lot of a single reign: but it was such a constitution as Rome did receive, and which it was afterwards enabled to bring to a state of greater perfection than any ancient form of government that we are acquainted with. Suppose the story of Lucretia false, we cannot deny that monarchy was established at Rome, and made way for consular authority about the time that Livy pretends, though that historian may be wrong in giving Valerius Publicola, and not Horatius Barbatus, as a colleague to Brutus. The valour of Horatius Cocles, and the fortitude of Mutius Scævola, may be left to the admiration of school boys; but the siege of Rome by Porsenna is no idle tale invented for their amusement, though it should be proved that the consequences of that event were not so honourable to the Romans as Livy has chosen to represent them. It is a disputed point, whether two or five tribunes of the people were elected at first: but does that doubt invalidate the fact of the secession to the Mons Sacer? Cancel three-fourths of the Roman victories and triumphs over the Æqui and Volsci, will it be less true that the former were nearly exterminated, the latter completely subjugated? Say it was gold, and not the valour of her dictator and his troops, which delivered Rome from the Gauls; she may surely boast of having lived to revenge herself on the barbarian foe, and of having, by a hundred triumphs, blotted out the stain of that transaction, and of the shameful rout on the banks of the Allia. In short, though we may sometimes pause when reading the early annals of Rome, and hesitate what judgment to form on many of the events which they record, there are landmarks enough to prevent us from straying far from our course, and to lead us on safely to the *terra firma* of her history."

With the substance of these remarks we fully agree: that is, we think it highly probable, that most or all of these characteristic facts had a substantial basis of truth: but still, if they were preserved only in tradition, the writers who first worked them up into a connected history, might perhaps not preserve any order of dates, and might supply the connecting links entirely from their own imagination. Plutarch informs us, that Diocles of Peparethus was the first writer who gave any credit to the early history of Rome, such as it has come down to us; but of this

Diocles nothing is known. An ingenious hypothesis might perhaps be framed as to the early history of Rome being fabricated out of materials taken from Greek writings. It is certain that many incidents recorded by Herodotus are to be found in Livy and Dionysius; and this coincidence may be observed in great and important events, as well as in those which are trifling and ludicrous. Of the latter kind is the story of Sextus Tarquin cutting off the heads of the poppies, which is an evident copy of the tale related by Herodotus concerning Thrasybulus and the ears of corn. A more remarkable parallel may be found in the birth of Romulus compared with that of Cyrus. Both, it must be remembered, were founders of great empires; both were exposed in their infancy: the one was nourished by a wolf, or, as the antiquarians interpreted it, by a woman whose name was *Lupa*; and the nurse of Cyrus was Spaco, which in the Median language signified *a bitch*. The battle of the Horatii and Curiatii may remind us of what Herodotus relates of the combat between the Argians and Tegeans, though in the latter case there were 300 on each side, and only three in the former. The history of Herodotus may bring to our recollection many coincidences of this kind; some of which, particularly the resemblance between Romulus and Cyrus, appear almost too striking to have happened twice and in different countries. We may remember also that Herodotus ended his days at Thurium, in the south of Italy: and it is well observed by Tiraboschi, that when the Romans are said to have derived all their literature from Greece, we are to understand Magna Græcia, from which country the earliest Roman writers came, and in which Thurium was situated.

Admitting, however, that much of the early history of Rome is fabulous, or borrowed from the histories of other countries, much of it may also be true: and whatever hypothesis we form as to this part of the subject, there will be difficulties to encounter, which the ancient Italian writers do not enable us to surmount. Thus it seems likely to remain for ever undecided, whether Romulus was the founder of a new city, or whether the Tuscans had inhabited it long before. That such a person as Romulus existed—that he came from Alba, and occupied a strong position on some of the seven hills, is too well attested by history and tradition, to be altogether denied; but at the same time, when we recollect that the Tuscan power extended over all that part of Italy, and that Veii was within eight miles of Rome, it is highly improbable that so good a natural position, as that which was afforded by the seven hills and the river Tyber, should have been neglected by that warlike people. Mr. Cramer mentions many facts which point out a connexion between the Tuscans and the early inha-

bitants of Rome (vol. i. p. 354.); and upon the whole no supposition appears to us so plausible as that which makes Rome to have been built and occupied by the Tuscans in very early times, and afterwards to have been seized by an adventurer from Alba.

We have not time to discuss at much length the probability of an Arcadian colony having settled on the Palatine hill. Mr. Cramer justly observes, that there is a great concurrence of ancient testimony in support of such an event; but he adds, that it is not probable that Evander actually came from Arcadia, as that district could never have been a maritime country. That the Arcadians were not a maritime people in the time of the Trojan war, or at least in the time of Homer, is evident from the fact mentioned by him of the ships which led their forces to Troy having been furnished by Agamemnon, "because they took no concern in naval affairs." But we have observed above, that when a nation or a tribe were in the habit of changing their abode, the name by which they were known might be left impressed upon different districts. That the Arcadians were Pelasgians, we know, not only from Pausanias, who expressly asserts the fact, but from the more ancient testimony of Herodotus. It is perfectly possible, therefore, that a tribe of the same Pelasgi who ultimately settled in the interior of Peloponnesus, may have sailed in very early times to the western coast of Italy; and thus an Arcadian colony may have settled on the Palatine hill, though they did not come from the country which was subsequently called Arcadia, and though the Arcadians of whom Homer spoke had no acquaintance with maritime affairs.

The classical reader can scarcely fail to have observed the total silence of the early Greek writers with respect to Rome. Aristotle appears to have heard nothing concerning it, though he took such pains to become acquainted with the institutions and the history of foreign states. Herodotus might have been thought still more likely to have mentioned it, and the more so, because he ended his days in Italy. He has however not once alluded to the existence of such a city. Scylax the Geographer, who is supposed to have written about the time of Pericles, is, as Mr. Cramer observes, the earliest writer who mentions Rome. Theophrastus, Theopompus, and Clitarchus, also alluded to it, as we are told by Pliny, and they lived a little later than the time of Alexander. With these exceptions, the wars of Rome, and her gradual encroachments upon the territories of her neighbours, appear to have caused little sensation beyond the immediate confines of Italy; a fact which might perhaps be brought to prove that Rome was for some centuries in a state of greater obscurity and insignificance, than the writers of the Augustan age would

endeavour to persuade us. There is reason indeed to think that the ancients possessed some traditions of the early intercourse between Greece and Italy, which are now entirely lost. Thus Justin tells us that the Phocæans, when they had left their country in the time of Cyrus, and were making the voyage which ultimately led them to the foundation of Marseilles, sailed up the Tiber to Rome; and made a treaty with Tarquinius Priscus, who was then king. Herodotus knew nothing of this story; nor, though he mentions the flight of the Phocæans in considerable detail, does he even state that they founded Marseilles. It would be rash, however, to conclude that the tradition preserved by Justin is altogether a fable. The dates assigned by chronologists to the reigns of Cyrus and the elder Tarquin, sufficiently coincide to make this visit of the Phocæans not impossible; and if Polybius is correct in saying, that a treaty was made between Rome and Carthage in the first year after the expulsion of the kings, the name of Rome must certainly have been known at some distance beyond her own walls, and even beyond the limits of Italy.

The Greek colonies in the south of Italy, which gave the name of Magna Græcia to that part of the country, must be looked upon in a very different light from the Pelasgic adventurers alluded to above, though Mr. Cramer has not pointed out the distinction with sufficient plainness. The Pelasgi, who visited the coasts of Italy in early times, cannot with propriety be called Greeks. They were themselves the settlers of that country which was subsequently called Hellas or Greece: and though their voyages to Italy were probably made at a later period, Greece itself was in a far too unsettled state for some hundreds of years to send out colonies into distant parts. The first Pelasgi were evidently a barbarous and unlettered race; they seem to have had little notion of civil polity, or domestic comfort; and their long voyages were probably undertaken more from a restless activity, and a dislike to settled habits, than from any political or commercial spirit. The Pelasgic Greeks learned the arts and institutions of civilized life from the Phœnicians and Egyptians; and the remark of Thucydides is probably correct, that it was not till after the lapse of many years, and a long continuance of internal wars, that Greece had leisure, or indeed the means, to send out colonies. Mr. Cramer indulges himself in paying high compliments to the spirit and enterprize of the Greeks, who, though possessing such an insignificant territory themselves, yet established settlements in every part of the Mediterranean. We should perhaps be more accurate in ascribing the earliest Greek colonies to the natural consequences of an increasing population. Confined in many instances to a narrow space between mountains and the sea,

and almost compelled to keep within the walls of a fortified town, they were obliged to send out colonies which might find a maintenance for themselves in some other country. And thus the numerous states of Magna Græcia gradually grew up into independent and flourishing republics.

Thucydides observes, that Italy and Sicily received their colonies for the most part from the Peloponnesus; and such we might naturally expect to have been the case. The local situation of Athens would direct their sailors to go eastward, and visit the coasts of Asia Minor; nor would they be often tempted to double the stormy promontory of Malea, and venture into the open sea to the south. The Peloponnesian states, on the other hand, and particularly Corinth, which had a harbour on the west side of the isthmus, would naturally send out their ships in that direction, which, after following for some way the line of the Epirot coast, would pass over, with little risk, to the opposite and neighbouring shores of Italy. Accordingly we are told by Mr. Cramer, that the Achæans "were the first to establish themselves on the eastern coast of southern Italy:" and the towns of Sybaris, Crotona, Metapontum, and Caulon, which were followed by Tarentum, Locri, and Rhegium, were founded precisely in the situations in which we should expect to find them.

The first settlements of this kind made by the Achæans may be supposed to have taken place about the year 720 A. C.; and though the new comers may not have been aware of the fact, they were probably descended from the same stock with some of the tribes in whose neighbourhood they settled. All writers appear to argue, that the *Ænetri* were the most ancient inhabitants of southern Italy; at least that they were the people who occupied the country when the Achæans first arrived there: and Italus, who had the honour of giving a name to the whole peninsula, is reported to have been a chieftain of the *Ænetri*. Mr. Cramer takes some pains to show, in opposition to Dionysius of Halicarnassus, that the *Ænetri* were not the aborigines of the country, nor descended from an Arcadian colony. We repeat what we have said above, that the first Celtic inhabitants and the Pelasgic adventurers who afterwards settled amongst them, probably became so intermixed, that it is hopeless to attempt to distinguish them; and the confusion, which prevailed upon this subject among ancient writers, probably arose from their not being aware that in some districts the Celtic population was most numerous, while in others the Pelasgi had gained the ascendancy; besides which, they appear not to have remarked, that the Pelasgi came to Italy from many different quarters, and at many successive periods.

When we reflect upon the opulence and prosperity to which some states of Magna Græcia attained, it must excite surprise, that so few architectural remains have survived to attest their ancient grandeur. There is, perhaps, no other country which was once so famous, and now presents so few interesting tokens to the traveller and the antiquary. The situation of many of the towns is still a subject of dispute. Some of them are known to have been in ruins in the time of Pausanias and Strabo; and, with the exception of Tarentum and Rhegium, scarcely any have retained their ancient name or even their former site. The temples of Pæstum are almost the only ruins which attract the notice of the traveller in that once interesting country; and they may be said to owe their preservation rather to the insalubrity and sterility of the neighbourhood, which has not caused any modern town to make use of the materials. Mr. Cramer says, in a note, "It is singular that no ancient writer has alluded to the temples of Pæstum, the most striking edifices unquestionably which have survived the dilapidations of time and the barbarians in Italy." We cannot, however, see any thing remarkable in this silence. It is probable, that almost every town in southern Italy possessed temples and other public buildings of equal or even greater beauty; for the style of the remains at Pæstum is of a character which, though bespeaking a very remote antiquity, is certainly inferior in elegance and in chasteness of design to many other edifices which still survive. The fact, therefore, of their not being mentioned by ancient writers is not at all more singular, than that the most celebrated statues, which have come down to us, the Apollo Belvidere, the Venus de' Medici, the Farnese Hercules, &c. &c. are not mentioned by Pliny, or any other writer, who has treated of the works of art. The reason perhaps, in both cases, is the same; that the Greeks or Romans would have said, in the words of King Henry,

"I trust I have within my realm
Five hundred as good as he."

The most singular circumstance concerning Pæstum is the total demolition of all the houses, and the level appearance of the soil which must once have been covered with buildings. It is a matter of authentic history, that Pæstum was finally destroyed by the Saracens in the year 915; and there is a tradition that the cathedral of Salerno received some architectural ornaments from this ill-fated city. But what is become of the remainder of the ruins? No other town, as observed above, has sprung up in its neighbourhood; there is a church and one or two houses within the walls; but, with these exceptions, there is nothing but the walls themselves, the three temples, and an amphitheatre, which

indicates the situation of an ancient town. The surface also is not particularly uneven nor strewed with fragments. The guides, it is true, will stamp upon the ground, and inform the traveller that it is hollow underneath; but if we may judge from the steps which lead up to the temples, the soil has not accumulated above the ancient surface to any remarkable degree. The same perplexity concerning the site of deserted towns presents itself in other places. The Campagna of Rome was once nearly covered with houses for many miles from the walls: excavations often bring to light some of the foundations: but the natural process of vegetation appears to remove the traces of the encroachments made upon it by man, with a rapidity of which we have no idea in our own country, where, fortunately, the ruin and abandonment of a town has not become a common occurrence.

We have a word or two to add concerning the roses of Pæstum. Every poet, every traveller, and almost every reader can quote passages which prove, as he imagines, that

“ ——— twice each year her storied roses blew.”

Mr. Cramer has collected nearly all these passages: but the only one which can support the idea of the roses blowing twice a year is that from Virgil, who speaks of

“ ——— biferi rosaria Pæsti.”—*Georg.* iv. 119.

but these words, if we understand them rightly, only mean—the rose beds of the *fertile* Pæstum—the epithet *biferi* being applied not to the roses, but to the soil of Pæstum generally, which, as in many other parts of Italy, produced two crops in the year. This also is a circumstance attended with some difficulty. There can be little doubt that the neighbourhood of Pæstum was luxuriant and productive in ancient times; whereas the soil is now marshy and barren, and the air unwholesome. The climate of Italy has certainly undergone considerable changes; but whether they are to be ascribed to some causes, over which art has no control, or whether the spots, which are now unproductive, might be reclaimed by a better system of agriculture, is a question which would lead us too far from our present subject. The following observations of Mr. Cramer are to the point, and may interest the reader.

“ It has been thought by some modern writers, that the climate and temperature of Italy have undergone some change during the lapse of ages; that the neighbourhood of Rome, for instance, was colder than it is at present. This opinion seems founded on some passages of Horace, (*Od.* i. 9. *Epist.* i. 7, 10.) and Juvenal, (*Sat.* vi. 521.) in which mention is made of the Tiber as being frozen, and of the rest of the country as exhibiting all the severity of winter. But these are circumstances which happen as often in the present day as in the time of Horace, nor

is it a very uncommon thing to see snow in the streets of Rome in March or even April. I witnessed a fall of snow there on the 12th of April, 1817. Whatever change may have taken place in some districts, is probably owing to the clearing away of great forests, or the draining of marshes, as in Lombardy, which must be allowed to be a much better cultivated and more populous country than it was in the time of the Romans. On the other hand, great portions of land now remain uncultivated, which were once productive and thickly inhabited. The Campagna di Roma, part of Tuscany, and a great portion of Calabria, are instances of the latter change."—vol. i. p. 10.

To the passages collected by Mr. Cramer concerning the celebrity of the Pæstan roses, we would add the following from Claudian, which might lead us to suppose, that this celebrity was owing to the country about Pæstum producing *double* roses.

" ————— vel flore sub uno

Ceu geminæ Pæstana rosæ per jugera regnant."

In Nupt. Hon. 246.

We could have wished that Mr. Cramer had entered a little more at length into the history of those ill-fated but interesting towns, Herculaneum and Pompeii. He says indeed, with truth, that so many books have been written on the antiquities and works of art discovered in Herculaneum, that the subject need not be enlarged upon here. (vol. ii. p. 176.) And with respect to Pompeii he refers the reader to "the many excellent works which are already before the public." (p. 180.) It is not upon the modern re-appearance, or the fossil antiquities of these two cities, that we wish Mr. Cramer to have entered into a discussion: but the date of their overthrow, as well as the history of the whole of this coast, which has evidently been ravaged by volcanic action in very remote times, would furnish an interesting and entertaining topic, which the research and ingenuity of Mr. Cramer would be well qualified to illustrate. The reader would hardly understand, from his description, that Pompeii, which is now at least a mile distant from the sea, was formerly a maritime town; and the different nature of the material which has covered the two places is a fact of considerable importance, when we are investigating the period of their submersion.

Mr. Cramer observes, "of the more complete catastrophe which buried Pompeii under the ashes of Vesuvius, we have no positive account; but it is reasonably conjectured, that it was caused by the famous eruption under the reign of Titus." (vol. ii. p. 180.) This was in the year 79; and, in our own country at least, there seems to be but one opinion as to this being the period in which the two cities were destroyed. There are, however, some reasons for entertaining doubt on this head. We have now lying before us a work published at Naples, in 1816, by C. Lippi,

the title of which is, “ *Fu il fuoco, o l'acqua che sotterrò Pompei ed Ercolano?*” and the object of the author is, to prove, what appears at first sight an appalling paradox, that the two cities were destroyed not by fire, but by water! The title of the book, however, might lead us to think it more absurd than it really is; and, in justice to Signor Lippi, we inform our readers, that he supposes these towns not to have been destroyed in the reign of Titus, but subsequently; and that their submersion was not caused by a volcanic shower, projected immediately from the crater, (or as he repeats it an hundred times, *non già dalla caduta delle ceneri vulcaniche, lanciate in aria del Vesuvio,*) but was the effect of long and continued rains, which brought down the volcanic matter that had been accumulating for ages on the sides of the mountain, and thus buried the town in what might literally be described as a stream of cinders. It is true, that the Academy of Sciences at Naples, of which Signor Lippi was a member, brought the question to a vote, and decided against his hypothesis by a majority of eighteen to two; and at a subsequent sitting they passed a decree, that no memorial of Signor Lippi, upon this subject, should ever again be entertained by them. Notwithstanding this very scientific mode of deciding the question, there are more grounds than might be supposed for adopting (if we may speak geologically) the Neptunian theory rather than the Plutonian. We cannot at present enter into the discussion farther than to state a fact, which is perhaps the strongest point advanced by Lippi, that in a covered cloister of the house, which stands outside of the walls of Pompeii, in the street of the tombs, a row of jars was found, some of which were filled with volcanic ashes. It might reasonably be asked, if that city was buried by a shower of burning matter descending perpendicularly upon it, how could these jars be filled when they were standing under a roof, and this roof was not destroyed? Signor Lippi argues, that they were filled by a stream of ashes which were washed into the cloister by a sudden inundation: and his reasoning seems more plausible, when we are told, that all the jars which were standing in a row were not found to contain ashes: the whole of the cloister was filled; the upper stratum was vegetable mould; beneath which was a layer of ashes; but the strata were not horizontal; and those jars only contained volcanic matter, the tops of which met the stratum of ashes: when the jars rose above this stratum they were filled only with soil, whence Signor Lippi argues, that the ashes did not descend perpendicularly, but were washed in by a stream of water. It may be added, that Sir Humphry Davy is decidedly of opinion, that the manuscripts found in Herculaneum had not been acted on by fire; and that the tufa, with

which the town is covered, "was the result of torrents laden with sand and volcanic matter, and descending at the same time with showers of ashes and stones." He tells us, also, that from the appearance of the exterior manuscripts, and the interior part of the manuscripts, they "must have been acted upon by water." Sir Humphry Davy probably held the opinion, which is confirmed by the authentic accounts of later eruptions, that water issued from the crater, together with the more solid materials; and though this is not the manner in which Lippi conceives the aqueous deposit to have been made, he may certainly appeal to the chemical experiments of Sir Humphry Davy as confirming his own theory, or, at least, not contradicting it.

We should be unwilling to conclude from these or any other arguments, whatever weight we may attach to them, that every commentator and antiquary has been wrong in assigning the destruction of Herculaneum and Pompeii to the year 79 of the Christian era. But history certainly lays some difficulties in the way of our adopting this belief. In the first place we may observe, that it is no uncommon thing to hear that the younger Pliny mentions the overthrow of these two towns in the letter which relates his uncle's death. Some of our readers may perhaps have entertained this belief. But if they will examine the letter, they will find that no mention whatever is made of Herculaneum or Pompeii. It is there stated, that showers of ashes fell at Stabiae, which was at a greater distance from the mountain than Pompeii; and, therefore, we may infer that the latter place was visited in the same way: but not a syllable is said in this interesting letter of these two cities being buried. It may be added, that the town of Stabiae has been covered to the same depth as Herculaneum and Pompeii: and since Pliny, who names this place, does not mention that the ashes had the effect of entirely overwhelming the town, we may infer, that the eruption which buried Stabiae was not that in the reign of Titus, but one which happened subsequently, and which may, at the same time, have destroyed the two other towns.

Tacitus is sometimes quoted as alluding to this catastrophe, when he tells us that some cities on the fertile coast of Campania were swallowed up or overwhelmed (*haustæ aut obrutæ*.) But he appears to be there treating of an earlier period than the year 79; and his expressions are more applicable to the damage which was done to these two towns by an earthquake in the year 63. Dio Cassius is the earliest, and we believe the only writer of antiquity, who expressly says that these two towns were destroyed by the eruption in the reign of Titus. He tells us that it produced lamentable effects in many other quarters, and

“totally overwhelmed two whole cities, Herculaneum and Pompeii, while the people were sitting in the theatre.” But Dio Cassius, it must be remembered, did not flourish till about the year 230: and what he says of the inhabitants being seated in the theatre at the time of the eruption appears evidently untrue; for two theatres have been excavated in Pompeii, and one in Herculaneum, and not a single skeleton has been found in either. We can hardly indeed imagine the calamity to have come so suddenly as not to have permitted the people to escape from the theatre, which is the meaning necessary to be given to the words of Dio: and the whole appearance of the streets of Pompeii, as far as the excavations have been carried, militate against the idea of the mountain having sent forth its fiery showers without any previous notice. It is impossible to read the description given by Pliny of the consternation which was caused by the eruption of 79, and to imagine that any inhabitants of Herculaneum and Pompeii would have thought of attending an exhibition in the theatre. It seems not improbable that Dio confounded the eruption of 79 with the earthquake which happened in 63; for we learn from Tacitus, that a great part of Pompeii was thrown down in the latter year: (An. xv. 22.) and Seneca, speaking of the same earthquake, informs us that part of Herculaneum was in ruins, and what was standing was in great danger at the time of his writing. Thus much is at least certain, even from the account of Dio himself, that the two cities were not so “totally overwhelmed” as he states them to have been; for he goes on to say, that Titus immediately despatched two consular persons into Campania to repair the damage which had been done, and to establish two colonies in Herculaneum and Pompeii. We learn the same fact from Suetonius, who lived at the time, and speaks of an eruption of Vesuvius, which happened in the reign of Titus, but does not mention Herculaneum and Pompeii by name. He adds that officers were sent by Titus for the relief of Campania, and that the goods of those persons who were killed by the eruption, and who left no heirs, were applied to the restoration of the cities which had suffered. This contemporary account may be depended upon as true; from which it seems plainly to follow, that the immense deposit of volcanic matter which concealed the two towns for so many centuries, could not have been the effect of the eruption in the time of Titus. Had they then been buried to their present depth, the emperor would never have thought of digging them out. It would have been vastly cheaper to build a new town upon the new surface which had been raised: and by that strong, and sometimes infatuated attachment which binds all men to their native spot, persons are

never wanting in that populous country to construct houses upon the tops of those which have been destroyed, and to sink their foundations in lava which is scarcely yet cold.

Tertullian, who flourished A.D. 200, might also be quoted as confirming the notion of the two cities being destroyed in the reign of Titus; for in refutation of the notion that every public calamity was caused by the anger of the Gods against the Christians, he says, that fire from Vesuvius covered Pompeii at the time when there were no Christians who could be accused; which expression, though by no means true, even if we apply it to the eruption of 79, yet requires us to understand it of some early period in the Christian era; and undoubtedly the year 79 is the earliest which the accounts of any historian will allow us to assign. Tertullian, however, lived in Africa, and did not write till 130 years after the supposed event took place: neither do his words necessarily imply that the town was completely buried: (*Pompeios de suo monte perfudit ignis*. Apol. 41.) and against these authorities we may oppose a remarkable passage in Florus. This writer, as he informs us himself in his preface, lived in the reign of Trajan, and he speaks of nearly 200 years having elapsed from the time of Augustus to his own. In the sixteenth chapter of the first book he dwells at some length upon the beauties and advantages of Campania: "Here," he says, "are mountains clothed with vines, Gaurus, Falernus, Massicus, and Vesuvius the most beautiful of all, which is a rival of *Ætna* in its fires: cities upon the seacoast, *Formiæ*, *Cumæ*, *Puteoli*, *Naples*, *Herculaneum*, *Pompeii*, and the very chief of cities, *Capua*, which was formerly reckoned one of the three largest cities with *Rome* and *Carthage*." Here is an author writing several years after the reign of Titus, and he names *Herculaneum* and *Pompeii* among the most beautiful towns on the coast of Campania. It might be said, indeed, that he was speaking of these towns, not with reference to his own times, but to the period of the Samnite war, the history of which he was then writing, and which took place in the year 340 A.C. This, however, seems highly improbable; for in the first place, in the very passage now quoted, he speaks of Vesuvius as a volcano, though the Romans had no account of any eruption previous to that of 79; and having alluded to this phenomenon, he would hardly have mentioned *Herculaneum* and *Pompeii* in the next sentence as flourishing cities, if he had known that they had entirely disappeared: and in the second place we may observe that, speaking of *Capua* as the chief of cities, and a rival of *Rome* and *Carthage*, he expressly uses the word *formerly*; from which it is natural to infer that, though in his time *Capua* had lost its distinguished pre-eminence, yet that

Formiæ, Cumæ, Puteoli, Naples, Herculaneum, and Pompeii, were still inhabited towns.

We are left, therefore, to conclude, that if Herculaneum and Pompeii suffered from the eruption in the reign of Titus, which they most probably did, (particularly Herculaneum, which is situated quite at the foot of the mountain,) either a part only of the cities was destroyed, or they were not buried so deep as to render the restoration of them impracticable.

It remains to be inquired at what period the catastrophe happened, which reduced them to the state in which we at present see them? If they were not destroyed in the reign of Titus, or if they were, and the emperor caused them to be rebuilt, when did the eruption happen, which again so completely overwhelmed them? This is a question more easy to be put than to be answered. It is certain that no subsequent historian mentions any explosion of Vesuvius, which had the effect of burying Herculaneum and Pompeii: but authors have reckoned up thirty eruptions since that of 79, and some of them are stated to have been awfully violent. A very great one took place in 203; and Tignius assures us, that in the year 472 there was such a shower of ashes projected from the mountain as to cover all Europe, and to reach even to Constantinople, which is nearly 800 miles distant! The Emperor Leo is said to have been alarmed at these unexpected visitors, and to have fled from the city in dismay!! The truth of this narrative may be questioned by persons who are not remarkable for scepticism: but those who invented such a story must have had some grounds for their exaggeration: and it is reasonable to conclude that the eruption of that year was greater than any of which the persons who saw it had any record. Some of our readers may perhaps be glad to have a list of the years in which other remarkable eruptions are stated to have happened: they were in 512, 685, 1036, 1049, 1138, 1139, 1306, 1500, 1631, 1660, 1682, 1694, 1698, 1701, 1737, 1751, 1754, 1759, 1760, 1765, 1766, 1776, 1778, 1779, 1794, with a few others which have happened recently. In some of the earlier of these eruptions the destruction of Pompeii and Herculaneum may have been completed. They may perhaps have been buried at different times: for the material, which covers Pompeii, consists of small ashes not cemented together, whereas the strata, which are cut through in the ruins of Herculaneum, are as solid and as hard as stone. If the proofs already given were not sufficient to convince us that the final catastrophe did not happen in 79, we may add, that the excavations made at Herculaneum have brought to light six strata of volcanic matter, which have evidently been deposited at successive periods.

The history of the whole of this part of the Italian coast would furnish interesting matter for discussion, if Mr. Cramer would undertake the investigation. It is sometimes stated, that the eruption in the reign of Titus is the first which is known to have taken place from Vesuvius. It may be the first of which we have any authentic details; but it was well known to the ancients that the volcano had been in action at a much more remote period. The streets of Pompeii are paved with lava; which to those who believe the destruction of the town to have taken place in 79, must be a proof that former eruptions had occurred, from which this lava had been formed. But no proofs upon this head are wanting. It is impossible to travel through Tuscany and Campania without observing volcanic matter, in beds of greater or less thickness, over nearly the whole surface of the country. The earth called Puzzolana, and the building stone called Tufo, so much used at Rome, are evidently of volcanic origin. Vitruvius has preserved a tradition of Vesuvius having exploded in ancient times; and Strabo and Diodorus Siculus both draw the same conclusion from the appearance of the mountain in their own days, i. e. in the reign of Augustus. The Forum of Vulcan, which is described by Strabo, appears, as Mr. Cramer observes, to be the extinct crater, which is now called Solfatara. Other names were given by the ancients to this part of the country, which seem clearly to point out that fires had been seen to proceed from it at different periods. The lake Avernus, the rivers Styx and Cocytus, the Phlegræan and Elysian fields, with many other scenes of classical celebrity, have all been placed in this neighbourhood; and that the descent to the infernal regions was somewhere thereabouts has been repeated by so many of the poets, that it is needless to quote the passages. Mr. Cramer doubts whether Italy contains the scene of Ulysses' descent into hell, and whether the Cimmerii, who "were covered with clouds and darkness, and who never saw the light of the sun," were understood by Homer to be situated in Italy. We have already given as our opinion, that the words of Homer, if taken in all their detail, do not seem to place the Cimmerii in Italy; but we have also hinted, that Homer probably had no definite idea as to where they were, but had only heard of such people from travellers; and since later writers certainly did place the Cimmerii on the western coast of Italy, it is not unlikely that the sailors who gave the account to Homer had been in those seas and witnessed the clouds of smoke which issued from the hills. There is every reason to think, that at some very remote period the whole country was on fire to a much greater extent than it has been within the range of authentic history. The battle of the Gods in the Phle-

græan fields, when mountains were piled upon mountains, like Pelion upon Ossa, may not unnaturally be traced to an ancient tradition of these numerous volcanos; and a Græcian or Phœnician sailor, when he returned home after having witnessed the phenomena of that tremendous coast, might be allowed to indulge himself in a little romance, and may very innocently have worked upon the imagination of the Homers of the day. Perhaps some of the miraculous events recorded by Livy and other authors may be explained by a reference to volcanic action. The showers of stones, which fell so often at Alba and in Campania, (both of them volcanic countries,) may have come from Vesuvius or other mountains. We would refer the reader particularly to Livy i. 31. & xxv. 7. in each of which places the words of the historian may easily be applied to the usual effects of an eruption. Pliny also mentions a shower having fallen in Lucania of matter resembling sponges, (ii. 57.) which could hardly be any thing else than pumice stone.

We must now take our leave of Mr. Cramer and his interesting discussions, having already trespassed too long upon the patience of our readers. We shall be happy to resume our acquaintance with him, if he continue, as we trust that he will, to carry the same spirit of research, and the same judiciousness of reflexion, into other parts of the ancient world.

ART. III.—*A Treatise on the Evidence of the Scripture Miracles.*

By John Penrose, M.A. London. Baldwin and Co. 1826. 1 vol. 8vo.

MR. PENROSE is already known to the literary world, (though not by any means so well known as he righteously deserves to be,) first, by his Bampton Lectures, which exhibit a masterly contrast between the true wisdom which has laid the imperishable foundations of Christianity, and that miserable counterfeit of wisdom which never fails to implant the elements of destruction in every work of imposture: secondly, by his "Inquiry into the Nature and Discipline of Human Motives," a performance of very high merit, but whose excellence is unhappily encased in a style of composition, penetrable only by resolute and vigorous application. He now appears again before the public, with the present *Treatise*, which fully sustains his reputation as an able and honest reasoner, and a profound and original thinker.

The plan of this *Essay* is very comprehensive. It consists of a preliminary dissertation, containing a statement of the nature

of miraculous evidence; and showing that, under certain conditions, the exertion of a power unequivocally superhuman must be held conclusive of divine authority; while the rest of the work is occupied with a detailed enumeration of the various evidences we possess for the real performance of the scripture miracles.—*See* Preface, p. xvii.

The author seems to be apprehensive lest the former part of this plan should be deemed a needless trial of his own industry and his reader's patience. For "wherefore, (he imagines it will be asked,) wherefore this proof, that in the *Scripture Miracles* we possess a certain sanction of truth? What Deist now imputes to magic, or to dæmoniacal agency, the miracles which we ascribe to Moses or to Christ? Who is there who does not allow them, if performed, to prove the agent's divine authority; or who questions any thing of them, except their real performance? Why attempt to prove what is not brought into question? Why beat the air by thus solving objections which no modern incredulity is found to propose?"—Preface, p. xviii. xix.

These apprehensions, we conceive, the author may confidently dismiss. For, in the first place, it must be readily conceded to him, that the "principles discussed in the Preliminary Dissertation form to the believer a necessary part of his entire series of proof;" a part, too, the more valuable, "because the notion, that real miracles may be performed, and yet not be decisive of a divine authority, has certainly been the persuasion, if not of the present age, yet of most ages of which we have any historical record."—Preface, p. xxi. But, in the second place, we believe that the principles in question are by no means inapplicable to the state of mind of many an unsteady believer, even at this day. We apprehend that there are persons who, though they would never think of imputing to magical or dæmoniacal agency the miracles of Moses or of Christ, are yet thrown into much perplexity by this consideration—that, if any created order of beings has the power of producing præternatural effects, the force of all miraculous evidence is much weakened, if not altogether destroyed. For, if Christ and Beelzebub can, each of them, alter the course of nature, how can we surrender ourselves, with confidence, to the guidance of either? It is evident, therefore, that such persons, unless relieved from this embarrassment, will find no refuge but in a total abandonment of the miraculous evidence, or in the belief, that no evil being can be entrusted by the Almighty with the privilege of working miracles; in contradiction, as we conceive, to the plain tenor of scripture.

It is well known that the latter branch of this alternative was chosen by Farmer; and to his vigour and acuteness we are

accordingly indebted for a triumphant proof, that no real miracles were wrought by the Magicians of Egypt, or by the Witch of Endor.* Unfortunately, however, he has pursued his principles to an extent which brought him into a wilderness of dangerous speculation, where his learning served only to mislead him. We hope that it will not be regarded as an unpardonable digression from our more immediate purpose, if we seize this opportunity of offering a few remarks which have suggested themselves to us, on a recent perusal of his work. We have the less hesitation in craving this indulgence of our readers, as the subject is intimately connected with the design of Mr. Penrose; and as the peculiar notions of Farmer are by no means extinct, though his work may not now be very generally read. And we shall heartily rejoice, if our observations prove in some degree corrective of the evils which appear to us inseparable from his scheme of thought relative to this very important department of theology.

The grand error then which runs through his treatise is, the presumption, that we are in a condition to judge what mode of administering the moral government of the world is, or is not, compatible with the moral perfections of the Deity. Finding himself unable to reconcile to the divine equity the permission of superhuman agency, to all appearance in behalf of falsehood, he exhausts his ingenuity and erudition in devising for himself a satisfactory mode of interpretation; a scheme which shall relieve scripture from the difficulties he attaches to the belief of any preternatural interference not proceeding *directly* from God.

Now, it may safely be allowed, that it would be an impeachment of the goodness of God, to assert, that He had let loose, on responsible and moral agents, a class of malignant beings, armed with fearful powers of delusion, and privileged to exert those powers according to their own caprice, without control or limitation. But how is his goodness impeached by the supposition, that such beings may have a limited commission, or an occasional license, to display superhuman agency before men? How can we be sure that it may not have formed part of his original design to allow such occurrences, either for the exercise of our judgment, or the trial of our faith, or for some other wise but unsearchable purpose? If to suppose the possibility of this, be to impeach the Divine Benevolence, or Justice, how can we peruse the history of mankind, or survey the state of the world, without finding a perpetual arraignment of those attributes? What shall we say to the numberless forms in which evil is allowed to enter into the mysterious texture of God's providence?

* Farmer's Dissertation on Miracles, c. iv. s. 1. 2.

and who shall confidently deny that the visible effects of malevolent spiritual agency may sometimes be among them? We all perceive that men are left very much to their own powers in seeing and feeling their way out of physical and moral difficulties; and Christians know that the honest exercise of those powers has the promise of a blessing. Why should these conditions be inapplicable to any particular class of difficulties or trials? Reasoning independently of experience, we might be tempted to pronounce that a gracious and righteous God would never suffer "a strong delusion" to go forth among his creatures, in any shape, or under any circumstances. But every day's observation confounds such reasonings and surmises. How then are we to prescribe the exact degree and kind of difficulty which is to attend the respective varieties of our probation.

In answer to all this we are repeatedly told that God can never give his sanction to imposture. But, how does it appear that any such sanction is to be implied from a license occasionally given to evil spirits to work wonders, more than from the general course of providence which has allowed so much success to human impostures of the most flagitious kind. It seems, so far as we can discover, a fixed principle of the divine government, never to lose sight of the moral probation of accountable beings. In that case every economy, whether providential or miraculous, must always be expected to propose the severest trials to our reason and our faith. And if spiritual agency is to be employed for our temptation in one way, it is difficult to see why it should not be permitted in another. If the Devil be allowed to assail us with secret suggestions, why are his emissaries to be wholly debarred from the grosser resources of delusion? Nay, more: can it be questioned that internal temptations may be incomparably more dangerous and subtle than the exhibition of lying wonders? Our suspicions are naturally armed, even against miracles, in support of questionable doctrines. But what mortal can, of himself, be a match for invisible principalities and powers, when engaged in a confederacy with flesh and blood; that is, with his own depraved and inordinate passions?

It is, indeed, maintained by Farmer, that miracles performed by lying spirits *must* be a trial too severe for all human sagacity and virtue. He allows, indeed, that the evidence of miracles is, in a certain sense, an instrument of our probation, because it must operate, more or less, according to the disposition of the individual. That it will not overcome inveterate obstinacy is manifest by the fate of the Gospel miracles. And, in every case, men must be left to the use of their moral and rational faculties, either in yielding to it, or resisting it, as a motive operating on

their conduct. But he will not allow that, in any case, the probation can be carried so far, as to leave the man to the guidance of the same faculties, in attempting to ascertain whether the miracle proceeds from God or from some inferior agent. He asserts that miracles, apparently in support of error, never could be permitted for the trial of mankind, because, by their very nature, they are calculated to *command* belief; to *establish* falsehood, if produced in *behalf* of falsehood; and, therefore, that the exhibition of them negatives, at once, all notion of probation. But how, then, it may again be asked, are we to account for the permission of counterfeit miracles, closely resembling the true; so closely, at least, that they must, infallibly, produce the same effect on multitudes, as if they were true?—so closely, that it must often require profound discernment and laborious inquiry to find out the imposture. We see that it *is* consistent with the divine perfections to suffer large portions of mankind to be deceived; to expose them perpetually to delusions, which a vast proportion of them seem utterly unprepared to resist or to detect. If wicked men, then, are permitted to come forward with signs and “lying wonders, and all the deceivableness of unrighteousness,” how can we confidently venture to exclude the agency of “seducing spirits” from the dispensations of God.

To this question Farmer seems to think it a sufficient answer, that “against human craft, human caution is a sufficient security.”* Now this, as a mere abstract and theoretical proposition, may be true. It is true, just as another analagous proposition is true, respecting the intellectual faculties of man; namely, that they are adequate to the most abstruse and sublime discoveries of science. Thus, it is undoubtedly true, that the human powers are equal to the complicated task of calculating the moon’s motion. But it is also true that, under certain circumstances of disadvantage, a journey to the moon is not a whit more impracticable than any such scientific achievement. Precisely in the same manner, it may be allowed, that there is no instance of human craft, that may not be matched by the highest degree of human caution and sagacity. But then, it should be remembered, that there must be innumerable instances in which the caution is not, and cannot be, opposed to the fraud. There is, indeed, a great practical approximation to the truth of the maxim, in a state of advanced civilization, and diffused intelligence, more especially in those countries where a free press, with its ten thousand eyes and tongues, is ever on the watch to detect and proclaim deception. But what becomes of this assertion in darker and ruder times?

* See Farmer, ch. iv. s. 5.

What is a horde of barbarians, or even a tribe of ignorant peasants, to do against a fraternity of practised impostors? At all events, what a length of time may elapse, and what irreparable mischief may be done, before the cheat can be exposed, and proved to be the work of wicked men! And, in the interval, how does the condition of those who have been deceived differ from what it might have been, had preternatural powers been actually employed for their seduction?

It is obvious that Farmer has, throughout, lost sight of an important distinction, which, in all inquiries of this nature, should constantly be kept in mind; the distinction between error, which, from its very nature, is insurmountable by human faculties, however exalted or improved; and error, which is unavoidable by individuals placed in certain predicaments. That mankind will not be exposed to errors of the former description, we all are strongly impelled to believe. That many portions of mankind are actually exposed to errors of the latter kind is notorious and certain; and there seems no ground whatever for confidently dogmatizing as to the classes of created beings that may be made instrumental to such delusions.

In order, however, to place his doctrine in the strongest point of view, Farmer supposes the extreme case of a heathen, encouraged to persevere in idolatry by a miracle wrought expressly for the confirmation of that practice.* The heathen in that case, for aught that we can discern, would be scarcely blameable for yielding, if he were entirely without any antagonist evidence of equal strength. At all events, he would be neither more nor less blameable than he would have been for yielding to evidence which he honestly believed to be miraculous, though in reality it might be nothing but delusion. But, if he should have before him, at the same time, miraculous notices of the only true and righteous God, it is difficult to see how he could stand excused. It should not be forgotten, that idolatry is invariably connected, more or less, with moral depravity. Supposing, therefore, (which is the extremity of concession,) the miraculous proof on either side to be equally strong, it would, at worst, leave the man neutral, if he were not led by his corrupt passions to prefer the more licentious institution. If fire had come up from the earth to consume the sacrifice offered to Baal, when the flame descended from Heaven on the altar of Elijah, the idolatrous priests would doubtless have exulted; and the Israelites might, without blame, have felt sore perplexity at such an appearance. But, even so, we know not that they would have been justified in at once deserting the

* Farmer, .c. iv. s. 5.

God of their fathers, whose statutes were pure and holy, and whose outstretched arm had attended them for ages.

But, after all, the history of the divine dispensations presents us with no such cases. It seems, indeed, impossible, with the Bible open before us, to doubt that superhuman intelligences may have the power of working miracles. Whether that power be inherent in their nature, or only consigned to them by special appointment, is an inquiry of little moment: for if such beings be allowed to interfere at all in human affairs, their interference must, to us, be miraculous, whether they are acting within their own natural sphere or not. But the great and important circumstance to be observed, is, that the exercise of such power is always represented as under limitation and control. In the Old Testament, the nearest approach to a competition of miracles is to be found in the contest between Moses and the necromancers of Egypt. Now let us, purely for the sake of argument, imagine that those impostors had the advantage of preternatural aid; and let us see whether, even in that case, the contest, as it is recorded, could have left on any well-regulated mind, a doubt as to the conduct demanded by the occasion. The sorcerers, we will suppose, were enabled, by a confederacy with evil dæmons, to convert rods into serpents, and water into blood, and to bring up frogs upon the land. But here the efficacy of their enchantments ended; and they were themselves compelled to acknowledge the working of a superior agent. And then followed such an august display of supernatural power as must have convinced any sane mind, that, if there had been any conflict of superhuman agency, it was between inferior spirits and the arm of Omnipotence! What comparison could there be between the performance of the magicians, and the potent word which called hail and fire from heaven, which spread over the land a darkness that might be felt, and which smote all the firstborn throughout the realm of Pharaoh? Let us imagine that we ourselves had been witnesses of these scenes, could we have hesitated a moment which to trust, the "juggling fiends" of Egypt, or the mighty God of "Israel"? Would it ever have occurred to us, that the "finger of the Lord" was to be resisted, because certain strange things had recently been achieved, either by crafty men, or deceiving spirits? Where, then, is the overpowering trial of faith or discernment, implied in such an exhibition?

If we turn to the New Testament, we shall find instances of dæmoniacal action, which all safe interpretation must pronounce to have been real.* The subject is, indeed, confessedly an

* "A late learned and ingenious author (Dr. Farmer) has written an elaborate dissertation to evince, that there was no real possession in the dæmoniacs mentioned in the

obscure and difficult one: but, whatever be its difficulty, it surely does not arise from any impeachment of the divine character implied in the reality of dæmoniack possession. The torments endured were the same, whether inflicted by disease, or by the influence of evil spirits. Whether the possession were real or not, the belief of its reality was suffered to become almost universal in Judea. Those reasoners, therefore, who allow themselves a license of speculation, respecting what is, or is not, consistent with the divine benevolence, will be sure to find much the same difficulty in the subject, whether the possession be held to have been real or imaginary. Neither can any fair objection be raised on the ground, that, if evil spirits could work such miracles, no miracles whatever can be decisive of divine authority: for, whenever the influence of these beings on the faculties of men, is brought under notice in the Gospel history, it seems to have been, partly at least, for the purpose of showing, that it was an influence exercised purely by permission, and under perpetual superintendence and restriction. If we had been taught to believe, that the Lord had ever totally abandoned his dominion over evil spirits, even for a time, and had left them to the unbridled exercise of their malice, in torturing, distracting, and deceiving any portion of the human race—we might, perhaps, have been strongly tempted to distrust all miraculous evidence, and to wish for some scheme of interpreting Scripture which should relieve us from so much perplexity. But our faith can be

Gospel; but that the style there employed was adopted merely in conformity to popular prejudices, and used of a natural disease . . . Concerning his doctrine, I shall only say, in passing, that if there had been no more to urge from sacred writ, in favour of the common opinion, than the name of *δαμονιζομενος*, or even the phrases *δαμόνιον ἔχειν*, *ἐκβάλλειν*, &c. I should have thought his explanation at least not improbable. But when I find mention made of the number of dæmons in particular possessions, their actions expressly distinguished from those of the man possessed, conversations held by the former, about the disposal of them, after their expulsion, and accounts given how they were actually disposed of; when I find desires and passions ascribed peculiarly to them, and similitudes taken from the conduct they usually observe; it is impossible for me to deny their existence, without admitting that the sacred historians were, either deceived themselves, in regard to them, or intended to deceive others. Nay, if they were faithful historians, this reflection, I am afraid, would strike still deeper.”—*Campbell on the Gospels*, vol. i. diss. vi. sect. 10.

“In the New Testament, where any circumstances are added concerning the dæmoniacs, they are generally such as show that there was something preternatural in the distemper; for these disordered persons agreed in one story, and paid homage to Christ and his apostles; which is not to be expected from madmen, of whom some would have worshipped, others would have reviled Christ, according to the various humour and behaviour observable in such persons.”—*Jortin. Rem. on Eccl. Hist.* vol. i. p. 10. Second Edition.

To which it may be added, that the language and conduct of our Saviour himself seems calculated to encourage the notion, that the patients were possessed by evil spirits, and not merely afflicted with epilepsy or madness.

in no danger of shipwreck, when we find that the infernal powers are produced, only to be rebuked and baffled. The dæmons are made subject even to the disciples of Christ : and Satan himself is seen falling, like lightning, from heaven. The right hand of God is put forth to restrain the malice of the Devil, as a pledge of the final and complete destruction of his kingdom.

On the whole, then, it appears, that, in our speculations respecting miracles, we are not required—because we are not enabled—to draw a clear line of restriction round the agency of invisible beings. But it also appears, that they who feel themselves compelled to admit the exercise of superhuman power by beings not absolutely divine, have nothing to apprehend from this admission. The only just inference from it is, that in this particular, as in many others, the divine government is profoundly mysterious. Inscrutable, however, as it is, there is nothing in this department of it to unsettle our reliance on miracles performed for purposes obviously unexceptionable and benevolent. There is in all the dealings of God, so much that is unfathomable by us, that it must be dangerous to frame our views upon the presumption, that this or that particular course of things is incompatible with his perfections. Whether by the agency of men or dæmons—certain it is, that delusions of the most abominable kind have been successfully practised. But this, assuredly, does not exempt us from the duty of exercising our judgment on every case of miraculous evidence connected with our salvation. And if we approach the task in a proper temper, we shall not fail to perceive, that the arm of the Lord has been revealed to us in a way that puts to shame all the works of darkness, whether carried on by human or by spiritual agency.

We trust that Mr. Penrose will not imagine that we have lost sight of him, or his treatise, in offering these remarks on the objectionable speculations of Farmer. We believe that we have advanced nothing but what is in full accordance with his own views. Our observations, indeed, are little more than an expansion of what is, very justly, suggested by himself, namely, “that it is by no means clearly necessary that God should protect our reasonings from all *possible* error with respect to miracles, more than other subjects.”—(p. 295.) And should any one complain, that his conscience and his judgment are destitute of a competent guide to conduct him through the difficulties incident to many imaginable cases of miraculous attestation, to Mr. Penrose’s preliminary dissertation, we should confidently refer him for satisfaction.

The principle there established by Mr. Penrose is as follows :—

First, that every superhuman act confers on the agent a superhuman authority, when appealed to for that purpose.

Secondly, that it may safely be concluded, that such authority is, not merely superhuman, but absolutely infallible and divine, unless one of two things can be shown; namely, that the pretensions of the agent involve some doctrine that is incredible or inadmissible, or that they are at variance with some authority unquestionably more potent. If, on the contrary, any inadmissible doctrine be involved, or any acknowledged and superior authority invaded, then we are bound either to suspend our judgment as to the performance of the miracle—(unless the evidence for it should appear quite irresistible)—or, at all events, to reject the pretensions of the person by whom the miracle is wrought. And, as to the difficulties which may, in some conceivable cases, attend the application of this rule, it is our duty to rely on the aid and guidance of that power, to whom we are taught to look under all other temptations.

For the establishment of these positions, Mr. Penrose appeals, as he is fully warranted in doing, to the moral and intellectual constitution of man. Wherever that constitution is tolerably sound, it will, of course, enable the inquirer to take the first of the above steps. No person in his senses can listen to a teacher who enlightens the blind, or calls down fire from heaven, without a much more profound submission, than he will render to an instructor, invested with no such superhuman powers. But, then, the *mere* exhibition of power, if wholly abstracted from all other considerations, will hardly be sufficient to make him bow to the superhuman authority, as positively infallible and supreme. He cannot be quite certain, that the wonders he has beheld may not be the work of some agent, inferior to the highest, but incomparably more potent than man. And though the power intrusted to such agents, either for good or evil, may be strictly limited, yet, if the limits which confine it are undiscernible by him, he can be in no condition to pronounce whether those limits have been passed or not.

How, then, is he to stir a step beyond the point to which he has advanced? How, but by following the natural impulses of a sound mind? And can it be doubted that these internal suggestions will lead him to reason thus: "I have before me the strongest evidence of an authority more than human. I further find myself incapable of questioning, that this evidence is, *primâ facie*, at least, a proof that the same authority is supreme. How, then, is this presumption to be converted into certainty? Clearly by the total absence of any thing to repel it. I feel, that in all cases it is unreasonable to refuse assent to the best evidence that can be

procured; that to do so, when the evidence is, of itself, nearly overpowering, and wholly uncontradicted, is little less than insanity. I shall, therefore, rely, without hesitation, on the miraculous evidence, as indicative of the divine will, unless it can be shown to involve any thing which renders that belief utterly untenable. If this reasoning be fallacious, the error seems to be one which no human integrity or wisdom can, under any circumstances whatever, possibly avoid: and there is something within me which dictates the assurance, that to such error the whole race of man never can be exposed."

Such appear to be, substantially, the views of Mr. Penrose, though not expressed exactly in his own words. We see no reason for withholding the fullest acquiescence in the criterion which he proposes. And, as for any practical difficulties which may occur in the use of it, they are such as never can "give pause" to any honest heart or unperverted understanding. Spinoza himself declares that, if he could be once persuaded that Lazarus had been raised from the dead, after lying four days in the grave, he would break his system to pieces, and embrace the Christian faith.* And we presume that there are few persons, (at least in Christian Europe) who, on witnessing such a scene, would not instantly throw away their doubts, without stopping to reason upon other cases of real or supposed miraculous interference.

But what, (it has been asked within our own knowledge,) what, if a person who had witnessed a miracle—for instance, the resurrection of Lazarus—should walk across the way, and there be present at the performance of another miracle, precisely similar, by another person of opposite pretensions? Would not these rival exhibitions shake to pieces his faith in all miraculous testimony? Would not one such instance for ever deprive all superhuman appearances of their power to command belief?

Now, in the first place, it may very safely be replied, that since the creation of the world, no instance similar to this has occurred; and that, to the end of time, as far as any thing may be averred with certainty, none such *ever will* occur. But, secondly, let us suppose the case to happen. Let us conceive a person to have beheld Lazarus rising up from the tomb. His impulse would undoubtedly be, at once to acknowledge that the person, at whose bidding the dead man came forth, was a teacher sent from God. And this impulse would be perfectly overpowering, unless something should occur to weaken, or to counteract it. Let us then, next, imagine that Judas Iscariot had at that time deserted his Master,

* Farmer, p. 110.

and that, on the very same day, another corpse were, to all appearance, restored to life at *his* word, in the presence of the very man who had witnessed the former miracle. What would be the conduct of that witness, supposing him to be a person of ordinary candour and discernment? Would he, without a moment's further examination, declare that, from thenceforth, he should consider all miraculous evidence as good for nothing?—that the proof must be worthless which could be brought forward by two such opposite characters?—that the miracles could give him no sort of confidence in the pretensions of either; and that, therefore, he should reject the authority of both? Would he not rather fall back on his convictions that the world is governed by a righteous and holy God, the source of all power and might? And would not these convictions compel him to pause awhile, and to suspend his judgment, in full confidence that, in the end, he should be graciously conducted through his difficulty? Or, if the agony of his embarrassment should, for the time, overpower the principle of faith within him, would he not, at least, feel himself prompted to compare the consequences of admitting the claim of one or other of these two wonder-workers? and (till his doubts should finally be cleared up) to take *him* for his guide, whose doctrine or pretensions involved nothing repugnant to the unalterable principles of right? Would not this be a much more safe and righteous course in him, than to distort and dislocate his faculties by an effort to throw off the pressure of all miraculous evidence; an effort which never can be made without the utmost violence to our nature? We are so constituted, that the concurrence of a superhuman act with unimpeachable tenets must be sufficient to compel the assent of every sound intellect. If a case should occur in which the condition of an unquestionable doctrine was wanting, or which presented the appearance of conflicting authorities, much perplexity and confusion would doubtless ensue. But the only way out of the difficulty would be to follow the guidance of our moral instinct, which, unless enfeebled or perverted, will always tell us that, miracle or no miracle, wrong never can be changed into right; and that signs and wonders, without end, could never justify us in embracing folly, unrighteousness, or impiety.

As for the case where the supernatural display, and the doctrines or principles connected with it, should be equally unexceptionable, on either side, we cannot insult our readers by wasting a thought upon it. That such a case never can occur, will readily be allowed by all who do not love disputation better than truth, and who have not lost all trust in the moral government of God.

We trust that the above statements will be amply sufficient to expose the despicable sophistry, which charges the friends of revealed religion with, first, proving the doctrine by the miracle, and then the miracle by the doctrine. One really would imagine, to hear the crowings and chucklings of the philosophers over this unhappy paralogism, that the believers were in the habit of debating with their adversaries after the following notable and sagacious fashion:—

“How can you, gentlemen freethinkers, reject the doctrines of Revelation, when you find them attested by such illustrious and astonishing miracles?”

“How? Why, in the first place, we doubt whether the miracles ever were performed; and, at all events, it is impossible to know whether they were wrought by divine authority or not.”

“O! but how can you entertain a moment’s doubt respecting these two points, when you see what glorious and heavenly doctrines we have to produce for their establishment?”

Now, most assuredly, if believers could be convicted of having so long contentedly followed their noses about such a circle as this, they would be fit for the very highest distinctions in the famous University of Noodledom; and would deserve nothing better than to be lashed for ever, with all their honours thick upon them, round that same circle, by the “puniest whipsters” of the infidel school. Before, however, they are invested with their suit of motley, it may be as well that they should be allowed distinctly to state for themselves the process by which they arrive at their convictions.

In the first place, then, they believe Jesus of Nazareth to be a teacher of superhuman authority, because he did such mighty works as exceed the power of man.

Secondly, finding neither in his own life and precepts, nor in the pretensions of other teachers, any thing to limit their reliance on that authority, they hesitate not to confide in it as absolutely conclusive and divine.

Thirdly, on the strength of his divine commission they receive all his sayings, and believe him to be the Christ the son of the living God.

Fourthly, perceiving the truths revealed by him to be capable of a highly moral and beneficial application, they feel strongly confirmed in the justness of their conclusion.

Lastly, being thus assured of his plenary authority, they rest on it, not only as proving his own *peculiar* doctrines, but as furnishing an additional and independent sanction to all the moral principles involved in his teaching. So that morality, which before may have appealed only to reason, now appeals to revelation also.

Now we should be glad to learn where is the illogical assumption in this proceeding? We have assumed, as an ultimate truth, what we suppose no one will deny, that man only obeys a natural impulse when he suffers himself to be powerfully influenced by great authority. We have also assumed that the inquirer is in a tolerable state of moral sanity; that he has in him the elements of morality; for, otherwise, the second step in the above process, if taken at all, would be taken in pure ignorance and blindness. Without such assumption, how could man pretend to be qualified for any inquiry relating to morals or religion? And what sceptic is there so besotted as to maintain, that, before we can become impartial judges in such questions, we must get rid of all our moral preferences and antipathies? No: the argument, as we have put it above, does not circulate. It does not merely bring us back to the point where we began. It sets off from the firm ground of instinctive moral perception; but it pursues a path which rises at every step, till it leads us round to a position infinitely more elevated and commanding than that from which we started; a position which enables us to survey, more clearly than before, all the grand truths of natural religion, while at the same time it opens a prospect of still greater magnificence, even the kingdom of the Redeemer, with "the glory thereof."

Let us hear no more then of the charge, that doctrines are produced by us in proof of miracles. It is not so. We only take care to ascertain that the teacher propounds nothing to shake the power, which miracles *naturally* possess, of commanding human assent. In doing this, we have recourse, it is true, to certain principles, without which man would be no more fit to institute the inquiry at all, than the calves of the field, and the asses of the desert. And surely it is not too much to say, that those principles (though they may derive fresh sanction from miracles,) are such as no miraculous evidence can overthrow. If a teacher were one hour to raise the dead, and the next hour were to propose, on the strength of that wonder, a scheme of faith and practice, which should confound the land-marks of good and evil, who can doubt that we should be fully justified in disregarding his miracles, and in rejecting his doctrine? The only proper reply to him would be—"Get thee behind me, Satan!"

By way of illustrating these views, let us suppose that an ambassador produces his credentials to a foreign prince, and that they appear to be in all respects complete. The next step is to examine the proposals which the representative is instructed to make on the behalf of his master. If they contain nothing grossly improbable or strange, the negotiation proceeds, of course, without any question as to the ambassador's authority. But what if it

should appear that his instructions are outrageously extravagant, or egregiously trifling and absurd—at variance with the obvious interests and the known character of his employer, or in direct opposition to the plainest elements of international law? Would not the members of the cabinet begin to look at each other? Would they not be strongly tempted to surmise, that they might possibly have given too hasty a recognition to the powers of the negotiator? Would they not suspect that they had been dealing with a person who had somehow or other fraudulently intruded himself into the diplomatic functions? And would not these suspicions lead them to look again, and a little more closely, at his credentials, and to see whether they could not discover there some traces of forgery and imposture? And what would be their astonishment at seeing one of their own body get up to protest against this proceeding—to condemn it as unworthy of reasonable and enlightened men!—to charge his colleagues with a breach of all the rules of logic—and to declare that he should be ashamed to act with men who could first examine the credentials of an envoy to authenticate his alleged instructions, and then canvass his instructions, in order either to verify or disparage his credentials!

This imaginary case seems to furnish as exact an illustration of the question as can be derived from any proceedings between mere human parties. And if it should be urged that miracles form a species of credential so essentially different from every other, that if they are not *in all cases* positively conclusive of the supreme authority of the agent, they can *in no case* be worthy of regard,—we can only reply, that to assert this, is to assume the whole matter in debate.

But it will be thought high time that Mr. Penrose should be heard upon this point, which, it may readily be imagined, he has not overlooked.

“We do not adduce the probability of the doctrine as affecting in any degree the proper strength of that testimony which we allege for the truth of the performance of the miracle; but only as increasing the capability of the thing taught to be sustained or supported by that same testimony.

“Nor is this mode of proceeding by any means peculiar to this particular case, in which the question is that of the evidences of religion, but is also adopted in almost all questions whatever, which the human faculties can be applied to discuss, as one of the best recognized laws of evidence. It is a fundamental principle that no testimony whatever can establish any known or clear contradiction to any truth already certain and allowed. It has already been shown that all vehement improbabilities approach to the nature of such contradictions. Supposing the evidence a known and definite power, every greater degree of improbability

is justly and strictly to be accounted a greater weight which that one and the same power has to sustain : and though some powers are equal to sustain enormous weights, yet if we allow any case to be once brought into question, we are entitled to argue, that the less the weight, or the greater the probability, the more constantly and certainly it may be sustained. Thus the same evidence on which we credit a probable, we habitually distrust, for an improbable, story. Byron's account of a race of giants in Patagonia, was discredited even on its first publication, by persons who certainly never thought of doubting that he had really anchored on the coast of that country. We have both parts of the relation on the same authority ; yet the authority, which is equal to prove the probable, is not equal to sustain with the same assurance the improbable part of it.

"So also as to miracles : and on the very same principle. And it is particularly to be observed with regard to almost all doubtful miracles, or miracles with regard to which men keep their judgments suspended, that some apparent probability possessed by those miracles is commonly the sole reason which operates to prevent their absolute, and perhaps universal rejection."—pp. 212—214.

And again, having observed that the miracles of scripture take a firmer hold on the mind, "because its doctrines are eminently probable, exactly coincident with what we know, from nature, of God, and with what we know of the moral faculties of mankind," he adds, very justly:—

"It is possible that all persons may not be able to appreciate this probability. But, as in that most just argument for the existence of God, which we derive from the common consent of mankind, we do not disallow the great mass of this evidence, because there may have been some few persons too ignorant to know, or too vicious to be disposed to believe in him, so also as to the probability of the Christian religion. There may be many minds too much imbruted in sense ; there may be many too much vitiated by pleasure, and many others too conceited and overweening, to be able to discern the just claims of a religion, which calls on man to be wise and holy ; which teaches him that in his relation to God, he must abjure the feeling of self-dependence, and bring every thought into obedience to Christ. But if these very ends be the best moral ends of religion, its having these ends is in fact its highest probability. And the goodness or probability of these ends is to be judged of, not indeed by the prejudices of a Christian education, however salutary some of those prejudices may be, but still less by the known prejudices of vice, by brutal ignorance, or by proud impiety. In every nation, and in every age, he that feareth God, and worketh righteousness, is the judge of the probability of the Christian system, in the degree in which its merits can be laid fairly before him : and that persons of this class are they who account it most probable, is, I believe, a fact which it would be quite idle to deny.

"It therefore is evident that the probability of our religion, supposing that we substantiate that probability, must weigh as an argument of the

reality of those miracles which we find brought to attest it. Nothing, I think, can be more indisputable than this conclusion; nothing more certain than that the Christian religion possesses, to every unprejudiced eye, which is able to take in all its pretensions, the highest probability of a divine original."—pp. 217—219.

A similar view is taken by Tucker, a writer of acknowledged acuteness, and whose habits of thought were as remote as can well be imagined from a servile acquiescence in established notions. He illustrates the subject in his usual style of ingenuity and originality:—

"If (says he) a man of honest, judicious character, but a little straightened in present cash, should receive a strong impression in a dream, that his deceased friend had bid him look under a particular bush, where he should find a purse of money; though he had no faith in dreams, it is very likely he might have the curiosity to poke about a little under the bush. If the direction had been, to lay five guineas there, which, on his returning, the day after, he should find grown to an hundred, he would hardly care to run the risk: yet, upon the advice being repeated four or five successive nights, with pressing entreaties and expostulations, he might be tempted to try the experiment. But, if he were commanded to break open a neighbour's house for the money, with an assurance of the deed being lawful and safe, I imagine he would require a better warrant than even twenty dreams, before he would proceed to execution. In like manner, if other persons had told him of having had such dreams, and found them accomplished in all points, upon following their directions, he would want different degrees of evidence to convince him of their being true.

"Therefore, where the facts reported are frivolous, unbecoming, or repugnant to our ideas of justice and mercy, they carry a higher degree of improbability on that very account: for though we have not so perfect a knowledge of what is agreeable to wisdom and goodness, as to render every thing appearing foolishness and evil, incredible, yet we must and ought to give their due weight to the judgments of our understanding, that salutary guide given us from God, for our general direction."—*Tucker*, vol. v. c. 11. pp. 493, 494, 495.

And to this it may be added, that the same considerations by which we pronounce on the credibility of a miracle, may fairly be resorted to, for the purpose of judging whether it came from God, should we feel ourselves unable to question its actual performance.

It is most truly observed by Mr. Penrose, that Scripture and reason conspire to sanction the two conditions, on which he insists, as a criterion; namely, a credible doctrine, and an unrivalled authority (p. 26, &c.). The first instance which he produces is the celebrated passage in Deuteronomy:—"If there arise among you a prophet, or a dreamer of dreams, and giveth

thee a sign or a wonder, and the sign or the wonder come to pass, whereof he spake unto thee, let us go after other Gods . . . thou shalt not hearken unto the words of that prophet . . . *for the Lord your God proveth you . . .* and that prophet, or that dreamer of dreams shall be put to death, because he hath spoken to turn you away from the Lord your God, which brought you out of the land of Egypt," &c. &c. &c. (Deut. xiii. v. 1—5.) In this passage there is no assertion that the sign or the wonder must necessarily be the sole work of human imposture. It merely inculcates upon the Israelites, that, in such a case, they might spare themselves the labour of any reasoning or inquiry on the subject. With the prophet or the dreamer they were to have nothing to do, but to reject him, and to stone him; and this, whether the fraud were purely his own, or carried into effect by supernatural help. And why were they to deal thus, even in the teeth of an appeal, verified by the event? Because the doctrine taught was idolatry; because the authority defied was that of Jehovah, whose uplifted hand had delivered them from the house of bondage; and because their allegiance to Him ought to be proof against all power brought into competition with his Omnipotence.

Again, when our Lord was charged with casting out devils, by the aid of Beelzebub their prince, his reply left untouched the question, whether the wicked spirits really possessed any influence in such cases. It seemed tacitly, indeed, to admit that they did possess it; but it turned chiefly on the absurdity of supposing, that, if such power really belonged to Satan, he would arm any one with it against his own dominion. In other words, it appealed to the whole tenor of our Lord's doctrine and ministry, which were in direct and notorious opposition to all the purposes for which the powers of hell could be supposed to interfere in the concerns of men. Here then is a case of miracles, which leaves it, at least uncertain, whether evil beings could not perform the like; but, which refers us at once to the principles and the doctrines connected with their performance, as a test whereby to determine whether they indicated a divine authority, or not. Our Lord, therefore, proposes a principle sufficient to guide us in every similar difficulty, and to distinguish, at all times, between the craft of the devil and the wisdom of God.

Once more; St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Galatians, says, "though an angel from heaven preach any other gospel unto you, than that which we have preached, let him be accursed:" a sentence which requires us to confront the miracle and the doctrine together, before we admit the authority of the former. It is to no purpose to say, that this is a burst of rhetoric,

introduced for the purpose of emphasis and impression. It may be so. But, like all good rhetoric, it assumes nothing that is not founded on reason and truth. St. Paul, of course, could not mean to intimate that an angel *would* ever display his superhuman power, for the perversion of the gospel of Christ. But he, doubtless, did intend to declare, that, even if such a case should happen, it would be the fault of the converts themselves, if they were not proof against the delusion. And if, at this day, Satan should clothe himself as an angel of light, and should propose any other name whereby men might be saved, but that of Jesus Christ, they who might be misled by him would certainly not have to plead, as their excuse, the insuperable force of the seduction.

So much for the error of those who conceive that any instance of supernatural action, produced, to all appearance, for the purposes of falsehood, disarms and disqualifies for ever all the miraculous testimony that can be alleged in support of truth. Of this error we think Mr. Penrose has completely disposed. The result of his whole argument appears to be this:—We cannot positively *demonstrate* that we are secure from impenetrable deceptions, practised upon us by invisible beings. But, nevertheless, we are so framed, that the first and natural effect of a miracle is to seize forcibly on our convictions. This power over the mind it will most certainly retain, unless the belief of it should appear to be incumbered with some dead weight of absurdity, licentiousness or impiety. Should this, however, be the case, from that instant the wonder begins to lose its hold. Its grasp relaxes gradually, and suffers us, at length, to retreat towards those imperishable principles, whose authority is superior to the force of any contrary evidence. Should the miracle be loaded with no such difficulty, we *inevitably* acquiesce in the authority indicated by it, as absolutely infallible.

The value of the principles established by Mr. Penrose, is not to be estimated solely by their application to the doubts and difficulties which may occur to Europeans in studying the evidences of the religion which they profess. They deserve the deepest attention of all persons, who purpose to engage in missionary labours among the nations of the east; especially those who have embraced the faith of Mahomet. The necessity of a very careful and very peculiar preparation for such labours, is forcibly shown, by a recent publication, edited by Professor Lee, in 1824, viz. *Controversial Tracts on Christianity and Mohammedanism*, between the late Henry Martyn and certain Persian Doctors of Islamism. To these tracts, Mr. Penrose has alluded in his Preface; and from them it appears that the

Christian Missionary in those countries has impediments to encounter entirely remote from all European apprehension. He will find adversaries whose strength lies in their very ignorance and perverseness. His condition will somewhat resemble that of an accomplished master of any exercise or pastime, who is liable to be perpetually defeated and confounded by the anomalous movements of an antagonist imperfectly versed in the true principles of the game. He will be met, at every turn, with objections which he would hardly have expected even from intellects in a state of pupilage. He will perceive himself to be engaged with minds, which have all the subtlety, indeed, but little of the solidity and good sense, which belongs to mature age. He will accordingly feel, at times, as if his own superior discernment and intelligence did but embarrass him, and disqualify him for the contest. He must consent to meet the adverse party upon ground which has long been abandoned, if it ever was occupied, in more enlightened communities. Of the disadvantages that will be arrayed against him, some notion may be formed by a statement of the leading principles current among the Mahomedan divines, on the subject of miracles. They maintain, then, that we can pronounce nothing to be miraculous, until we are in full and perfect possession of all that can be accomplished by human ingenuity and science. Is water turned into wine? the most eminent alchymists of the age must be assembled to determine whether we can safely pronounce such a change to be the effect of superhuman power. Should inveterate diseases be healed, or faculties restored to the disabled, our judgment must be suspended, until an inquest of physicians shall have sat upon the case, and decided on its character. Should tempests be silenced, or the dead raised, by a word, nothing is to be concluded from the wonder, unless a synod of magicians should declare that such an achievement is beyond the resources of their art. From these principles it would follow, that as the world is in a state of improvement, it cannot be known till the day of judgment, whether extraordinary acts are miraculous or not.* They maintain, further, that the evidence of those facts, which Jews and Christians call miraculous, is becoming constantly feebler by lapse of time; and that, in the course of centuries, it must waste away into insignificance.

It may be asked, then, how it is that the Mahometans have agreed to regard Moses and Jesus Christ as invested with the prophetic office at all, or to allow that any miracle ever was wrought by them? The answer truly is, that we are *wholly* indebted for this concession to the declaration of their own pro-

* Controv. Tracts, pp. 194. 215.

phet!—and that, but for him, the world would, to this day, have remained in utter ignorance whether the wonders related in our Scriptures were wrought by power from on high, or merely by virtue of an acquaintance with certain occult powers of nature. Take the statement of one of the Persian disputants :

“ As to the miracles of Moses and Jesus being equally convincing, we say we owe this to the relation of a prophet, namely, Mohammed. And upon the supposition of his having withheld his testimony to this point, we should not have had the means of forming an opinion, much less of obtaining an assurance, that they were prophets, and their works miracles.”—*Controv. Tracts*, p. 241.

The question then occurs, how is it that they have contrived to satisfy themselves that the pretensions of their own prophet were well founded? And here we have a most remarkable instance of the perverse ingenuity which sometimes leads men to glory in that which is their shame, and to derive strength and confidence from that which is their weakness! They lay it down as a maxim, that any one who does a wonderful act,—who appeals to that act in support of his prophetic authority,—and accompanies it by a successful challenge to all the world to perform the like, has a claim to the belief and obedience of mankind. And they affirm that Mahommed is the only teacher who has, beyond all question, satisfied these conditions. The Koran is *his* wonderful work. To that he appealed for the establishment of his authority. And the work itself abounds with repeated challenges to all mankind to produce a single sentence that approaches it in beauty and grandeur. These challenges have been unanswered for 1200 years. It may, therefore, safely be presumed, that they will remain unanswered till the end of time; and that to rival even a line of this one book, is a task which exceeds all the resources of genius or science. Besides, the wonders performed by Moses or Jesus were designed purely to make an impression on vulgar minds in a state of society comparatively rude and dark; and whatever force may have belonged to them, the lapse of ages has ever since been wearing away. The Koran, on the contrary, is a permanent and incomparable miracle. It is addressed purely to the intellect. Every year that elapses, and every advance that is made in mental attainment, does but contribute strength to its evidence; for the greater the improvement of the human powers, the more complete must be the triumph of that work, which continues to defy all competition!

Now, when it appears that such opinions as these are current among the learned professors of a religion, credited by so many millions of the human race,—opinions which represent the Scripture miracles as *wholly inconclusive*,—it is highly important that all who propose to themselves a conflict with the errors of that

religion, should very distinctly count the cost, and survey the difficulties, of such a warfare. And, for this reason, we should earnestly recommend to such persons a careful study of Mr. Penrose's book, as containing the soundest principles, relative to this subject, in which the missionary can be trained. At the same time, it would be somewhat too sanguine to suppose, that the principles laid down by him *must* be decisive in the controversy with a Mahometan. Before complete success can be expected, the Musulman must be persuaded to lay aside some of his peculiar notions respecting miraculous agency. The principle of Mr. Penrose is this: that an act above human power indicates a superhuman authority, if connected with a credible doctrine, and confronted by no superior authority. Now this the adversary might possibly grant: but then he would be certain to reply, that an act *not above human power* can confer no superhuman authority, let the doctrine be what it may; and then he would add, that the wonders shown by Moses or by Jesus, do not *certainly* indicate any superhuman agency; but, on the contrary, are unquestionably within the compass of human art. If, according to their notions, magic necessarily implied a confederacy with superhuman agents, then Mr. Penrose's principles might be brought at once to bear directly on the question. But, unhappily, magic appears to be regarded by Mahometans as a purely human accomplishment; as a science of extreme difficulty indeed, and of rare acquisition, but accessible to minds of superior energy and penetration. A proficiency in it, therefore, confers, in their estimation, no divine or even superhuman sanction on the adept, more than a proficiency in any other abstruse art. The antagonist of Martyn would, probably, decline to acknowledge a claim of prophetic authority, on the strength of the pretender's walking on the sea, or raising the dead, just as he would refuse to receive Sir Humphry Davy for a prophet, merely on the strength of a most astonishing course of chemical experiments.

That the above is a just representation of the notions entertained by every learned Musulman, respecting the powers of magic, may be seen from the words of Mohammed Ruza, in his reply to Martyn:—

“ It is very well known that acts, in all appearance similar to those performed by the prophets, have been performed by sorcerers, magicians, and jugglers. Those who are skilled in talismans or necromancy have performed, and do still perform, such wonders as to effect a change in the real essence of things. They are able so to affect the winds, as to restrain them from blowing; both men and animals, so as to deprive them of motion. Besides, there was a well known magician who kept seven camels in a string, and who, entering in at the mouth of

the first, and passing out at his tail, would, with the greatest ease, pass through them all."—*Controv. Tracts*, p. 207.

And again,—

"Although the restoration of a dead man to life by Jesus cannot be ascribed to the effect of medicine, (which has nothing to do with the mere enunciation of a word, or the exertion of the will,) still it might be ascribed to enchantment. For we ourselves have witnessed the recovery from pains and fevers effected by mere incantation: from a few lines drawn upon a wall, much trouble and distress caused: and the spleen removed by driving a nail only into the middle of a cube! It will be difficult to say whether any of the acts of Moses or Jesus exceeded these; or whether any one who can remove a pain or a fever by no other means than merely reciting an incantation, may not, also, restore one to life who has been three days dead. We believe he may restore one who has been dead a much longer time!

"If it be objected that no enchanter has hitherto appeared who has, either by art or the operation of medicine, restored a dead man to life, we reply: It is sufficient for us, if they have performed what we have already mentioned; for their inability to do the rest may have resulted from *their want of experience*; as it is well known that very few acquainted with these arts have hitherto appeared in the world; and that, therefore, the *power of human nature*, in these respects, is not yet so far known, as to make it certain that any one thus skilled may not also restore a corpse to life."—*Controv. Tracts*, p. 211—213.

Now, what is to be done with people who are in such a state of mind as this? What can be hoped from the advancement of the soundest principles in opposition to such barbarous ignorance and credulity? We have here precisely the same stupid and childish persuasion of the reality of enchantment, as that which often retarded the reception of the Gospel in the primitive ages. And all argument must be utterly vain, until this persuasion shall have retired before the light of a sounder philosophy, and a juster view of the limits of human power; such a view, for instance, as that which is given by Mr. Penrose in the first chapter of his work.

An enlightened and impartial moderator over the dispute would, indeed, find but little difficulty in deciding it, even without an absolute and total rejection of the Mahometan notions. He would see, that when an important and beneficial revelation is attested by stupendous wonders, it is little less than downright insanity to question it, because, forsooth, there is surmised to exist a certain rare, occult, and mysterious science, whose powers, for any thing that can positively be known to the contrary, may be adequate to the production of similar effects. He would perceive, that, in such a case, we are no more warranted in resorting to the supposition of magic, than to that of an interference by superhuman beings, independently of God. He would further

not fail to observe, that, by the concession of the adversary,* no magician has yet been found who has restored a corpse to life; and that, therefore, we have no reason to believe that such an achievement is within the powers of enchantment. And if it were urged, that things as difficult have been notoriously accomplished by magicians; he would remark that our *confessed* ignorance respecting the extent of magical agency, disables us from pronouncing as to the comparative difficulty of its operations. He would, also, observe, that whenever a pretender to the prophetic character performs an act apparently above human power, and appeals to it in support of his pretensions, that very appeal virtually involves a public challenge to the performance of similar prodigies. Now it is obvious that Jesus appealed to his wondrous works, as evidences of his character: and yet the raising of Lazarus, and his own resurrection and ascension, are events, which, for 1800 years, have never been rivalled or approached. All this, and much more to the same purpose, would naturally suggest itself to a plain, unmystified understanding. But all this, we have very little doubt, would be urged quite in vain upon Hagi Elharamein Mohammed Ruza of Hamadan, or upon Mirza Ibrahim, preceptor of all the Moolas!†

But even if we were to succeed with the professors of Mohammedism in this part of the argument, a still more serious difficulty would remain; namely, the adventure of dislodging them from that other refuge of lies, their belief that the Koran is, itself, the most stupendous and irrefragable of all miracles, and sufficient to exalt their Prophet very far above Moses or Jesus Christ. It appears to us that this is a notion which can hardly be expected to yield to any process of reasoning. It is a mixed affair of taste and superstition, two of the most intractable elements that argument can have to encounter. It is a prejudice which probably never will give way to any direct assault. A wider acquaintance with the literature and science of other nations, and especially of Christian Europe, might gradually make some impression upon it, if such enlarged knowledge were not interdicted by the very spirit of the Mohammedan faith. Professor Lee evidently considers the case as hopeless; and, accordingly, recommends that the ground of miracles be altogether abandoned, and that of prophecy assumed, as affording much more safe and advantageous positions against a Mohammedan disputant. We cannot, however, but think that the Musulman might, at least, be silenced (though he certainly would not be convinced) by the retort, that if the Koran be a miracle, it is a miracle only to the Arabs; and

* Controv. Tracts p. 213.

† See Controv. Tracts, preface, p. cxv. cxx.

to few, probably, except the learned and accomplished, among them : that the rest of the world must judge of it by a translation, as the generality of Christians judge of their Scriptures ; and that, under this disadvantage, which is common to both, the Bible appears to us in all respects incomparably superior to the Koran.

Notwithstanding all these obstacles, however, we fully agree with Mr. Penrose, that it is of the last importance to have the whole question of miracles, in all its bearings, accurately settled. The argument respecting them is a weapon, which should be brought to its highest perfection of keenness and brightness ; and should be kept in readiness to assail this monster, if ever it should be stripped of the scaly epidermis, which now seems to render it invulnerable. And it must be allowed, that the skill and labour of Mr. Penrose have been eminently valuable in preparing the weapon for this conflict, and for every other service in which it can be employed.

The above speculations have detained us much longer than we originally intended. They relate, however, to matters of measureless importance. And we have for this reason been unwilling to resist the impulse communicated to our own thoughts by the work of Mr. Penrose ; or to neglect an opportunity of co-operating with him, in the attempt to give a right direction to the minds of persons sincerely inquiring into the grounds of their faith. We regret, however, that these discussions have left us so little space to devote to the main body of the work, which is well worthy of a full and careful analysis.

We have had occasion already to advert incidentally to the First Chapter, the object of which is, to prove that those facts, which are related in Scripture as miraculous, were so in reality ; that is, were acts clearly and unequivocally superhuman. And this, of course, involves the discussion of a question, to which we have before alluded ; namely, the extent of mere human knowledge and power.

The Second Chapter is divided into six sections, and contains an array of the evidence we possess of the actual performance of those wonderful works. In considering the direct evidence, Mr. Penrose makes a judicious selection of four examples, in order to exhibit, broadly and distinctly, the foundation of our assent to the fact, that such things were really and truly accomplished—viz. (1.) The pillar of fire and cloud which conducted the Israelites. (2.) The restoration of the blind man to sight, as recorded in the 9th chapter of St. John. (3.) The resurrection of Lazarus ; and (4.) our Saviour's own resurrection. The author then considers all the auxiliary evidences : disposes of the objections, that our proof is derived from interested parties ; or that it is enfeebled by lapse of ages ; and shows that, though time may weaken the

power of the strongest evidence to impress and interest the attention, it never can destroy or diminish the real weight and value of such evidence. The sixth section recapitulates the preceding arguments and conclusions, and shows the futility of the hypothesis, that credulity made the disciples believers; and that their enthusiasm, seconded by pious fraud, propagated their belief throughout the Jewish and Gentile world.

From this chapter we might easily select abundant extracts, calculated to show the patient meditation with which the author has explored all the depths of his subject. There are, however, few parts of the treatise to which the attention of the reader might be more profitably directed, than to the latter part of Section III. We all know that the love of the marvellous is a most valuable and convenient topic in the hands of the freethinkers. It saves them a world of thought and research. Into this quality they resolve all the histories of preternatural agency. Mankind, they tell us, are by nature voraciously credulous; and superstition is intensely contagious; and, as for enthusiasm, its operation is absolutely electrical: it is propagated with the force and rapidity exhibited by the galvanic battery. Accordingly, the demand for wonders has, in every age, been so universal, and so insatiable, that wise men have thought it necessary to provide a vast limbo, amply stored with every imaginable variety of prodigies, in which the public mind might at all times expatiate and take its pastime. That this is the right solution of all questions relative to miracles is obvious: for has not Dr. Johnson himself told us; that he would make half London believe that they had seen a man walk across the Thames, dry-shod? and why, then, should not Moses make the Israelites believe that they had themselves walked dry-shod over an arm of the Red Sea? There is no portent in the annals of the marvellous that was ever more greedily swallowed, than this notable account of all wonders is received, from the mouths of their professors, by the scholars of the *freethinking school*—falsely so called!—the school, rather, whose disciples would more willingly endure a month at the Brixton tread-wheel, than encounter, for half an hour, the toil of *really* thinking for themselves. We wish the masters and pupils of this *ludus impudentiæ* no worse a penance, than to lay aside their nonsensical and lying vanities, and to pass a little time with Mr. Penrose. It would be weariness to their very flesh to come to close quarters with an honest and steady thinker. But the discipline would be wondrous salutary! And to such among them as have not yet their “whole head sick, and their whole heart faint,” with the enervating influences of their vile Castle of Indolence, we would earnestly recommend the following consi-

derations. After remarking, that in all questions of evidence, the character of the witnesses is a point of primary importance, Mr. Penrose proceeds thus:—

“ But the Scripture witnesses are in all respects unimpeachable. Nothing can be less tumultuary, nothing less enthusiastical, than the whole style and character of all their relations. I know of no narratives composed by leaders of parties, as the sacred historians, no doubt, in some sense were, in which there exists, together with the same perfect sincerity, so little of that natural heat with which an actor relates acts of his own, or with which a follower details the history of his chief. They are all written with a very impressive, but at the same time with a very subdued, tone of feeling. They are all the compositions of grave and sober men, who had a degree of sadness mixed up in their composition, or who appear to have written under a most awful sense of their high responsibility for the exact accuracy of their relations. They report the life and doctrines of a divine instructor: they think themselves made ‘ a spectacle unto the world, and to angels, and to men.’* They recount their own errors, and even their incredulities, and this humbly, not in that confident boasting of which vice is often made the occasion. Are these the men of whom, under all these circumstances, we are to suppose it imaginable that they were so blinded by enthusiasm that they could not discern the clear evidence of the senses ?

“ In the Epistles, no doubt, written by some of these very men, a great ardour, or it may be said enthusiasm, is to be discerned. But then this is only the natural consequence of an entire conviction of the truth of the fact, and also a consequence which that conviction must have produced even in men of the most cautious temperaments. To be cautious in receiving all new facts and opinions, and to be ardent in asserting them when we are convinced of their truth, is the very perfection of our active and intellectual powers. And that the coolest and variest of all the disciples, who may have examined most critically all the evidence of Christ’s miracles, should become on conviction a most zealous assertor of all the doctrines which his divine master delivered, should put forth in his teaching all the spirit of a devotee, is only a consequence in the natural order of things: or rather it proves that those teachers who were first entrusted with the promulgation of our holy religion, were selected with that consummate knowledge of the human heart which belongs in perfection to Him only who formed it. Thus it appears to me certain that the natural temper of the witnesses was that of men in whom, if we can confide in any man, we may confide as being accurate judges of fact, as persons not likely to be carried away by credulity.

“ The most important point, however, is, that all credulity requires a previous disposition either to believe the particular fact proposed to it, or in the case of a miracle, to side with that cause in which the miracle is said to have been performed. If, in a question relating to matters of fact, we have reason to distrust the evidence of a mob, or of any individual whose powers of discrimination we are inclined either to suspect

* 1 Cor. iv. 9.

or deny, it is because their prejudices are on that side to which they depose. One of those prejudices, it may be said, is the love of the marvellous.—But it is not so in cases where the belief of the marvellous runs counter to any other prepossessions either more rooted, or equally rooted, in the mind. Even in the most stupid and ignorant men the love of the marvellous, or, it may be said, credulity in general, is certainly not more strongly rooted than the contrary vice of a stubborn resistance to evidence, where the evidence is for what they do not choose to believe. He who will obstinately resist equal proof of another kind will resist obstinately also the evidence of miracles. ‘They who believe not Moses and the prophets, will not be persuaded though one rose from the dead.’ If we regard the miracles of the Abbé Paris as genuine, we cannot doubt but that the Jesuits were no less inclined to refuse the credit which was justly due to them, than if we regard them as having been only fallacious, we conclude in like manner that it was the inclination of the Jansenists to embrace them with far more eagerness than they were worth.

“But the miracles which were performed by Moses and Christ are wholly clear of every possible imputation of resting on the evidence of men who *swallowed* them greedily. Of the temper of the Jews in their passage to Canaan, if we know any thing, we know that their prepossessions were to return to Egypt, to rebel against Moses, to prefer Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, to him. Assuredly, with this temper, they were far more likely to dispute a true miracle than to believe in a false. And with regard to our Saviour, we have not only the testimony of enemies,* but also the testimony which we have of the friends of the religion is the testimony of men whose prepossessions could not have warped them in bearing witness to the miracles which they record.”—(pp. 152—157.)

In Chapter III. it is shown, by a satisfactory investigation, that imposture never was supported by such evidence as that by which the Scripture miracles are established. In the course of this chapter some very judicious and acute remarks are introduced respecting the attempt of Julian to rebuild the Jewish temple. The following observations on that subject appear to us highly important.

“I have to add, also, farther, that this miracle comes to us on far less evidence than the Christian miracles, because it is less connected with other facts, or with history. This story of Julian is of a mere insulated fact. True or false, there is nothing else which depends on it. But the miracles of Christianity, and we might say the same of those of Judaism, are the very hinge of the whole system. Setting aside the question whether they were performed or not, the belief of those miracles is, beyond all doubt, one great principle or cause of its propagation. Deny the story of Julian, and the main series of history goes on still as before. Deny Christ’s miracles, and you have still to explain how the belief of Christianity could be imposed on mankind: you have a chasm in history

very difficult to fill, but which must be filled, if you would assign any cause at all of events which have, and have had for ages, a most considerable influence on human affairs.

This point of view, I may add, seems to me so important, that though we were to concede the validity of the whole claim made by Gibbon for the strength and efficacy of those mere human causes to which he ascribes the propagation of Christianity, I do not perceive that the just evidence of the religion would be materially weakened by that concession. To a certain extent Gibbon's argument is, no doubt, valid. It explains *much*, and it does not greatly matter *how much*, of the method used to effect the establishment of the religion. But the *germ* of the religion it leaves wholly unaccounted for, except on the supposition of those original miracles of which it has been the business of this treatise to assert the performance. In truth, in the work of this eminent historian there is but little, *in the way of argument*, which we need distrust on the ground of its unfairness towards the Christian religion. The disgrace and the mischief of its offence against religion consists almost wholly in the moral contagion of that sarcastic impiety which pervades it, and which, though each drop makes but a feeble impression, is from mere repetition dangerous in the extreme, and will often have even on the philosophical mind an effect almost mechanical."—(pp. 253—255.)

Of the truth of these latter remarks, we are most fully persuaded. We have little doubt, that if the pages of Gibbon were to be entirely cleared of every thing like ironical and profane insinuation, and the 15th and 16th chapters were to be perused for the first time by a person, unsuspecting of the historian's infidelity, he might rise from the perusal as ignorant of that circumstance as he sat down. His impression might be, that he had met with a powerful statement of the secondary causes employed by Providence for the *propagation* of Christianity, without dreaming of an insidious design to disparage its divine original.

The Fourth Chapter exposes the unreasonableness of the demand which scepticism sometimes makes for more full and cogent miraculous evidence; and contains a very striking exposition of the consequences which probably might have resulted from a more general conviction among the Jews of our Saviour's resurrection and Messiahship. Had the whole nation been then won over to Christianity, it must have become identified with Judaism, and might, on that account, have been condemned universally throughout the heathen world. Besides, if, on our Saviour's resurrection, the Jews had become *friends*, we should have lost all that invaluable evidence for the miracles, derived from the knowledge that they were held to be undeniable, even by Jewish *adversaries and persecutors*. To these considerations Mr. Penrose adds, that an union of Jews and Christians at our Saviour's death, would hardly have prevented the rebellion of the whole nation against the Roman

yoke ; an enterprize which, whether successful or not, must have been highly discreditable to the Christian cause.

The rest of this chapter is employed in showing that the evidence of the Christian miracles is of a nature which leaves full scope for the exercise of our moral faculties. "The proof, though decisive, cannot be completed without a long and attentive derivative process." During this process, the bad passions may be secretly at work "to poison the welcome" of humiliating truth, while it is slowly winning its way into the mind : and the vigilance necessary to counteract and repress their influence may convert the inquiry into a trial of the heart as well as the understanding. And if it be objected, that the miracles could impose no moral probation on those who saw them performed, it may be replied, that the exercise of candour and fairness, at that time, consisted in making the inference, that the miracles were wrought, not by magic, or by dæmoniacal agency, but by the power of God : an inference, which, from the state of opinion in those days, was very far from being a matter of course. The whole of this discussion from page 278, to the end of chapter IV., deserves to be most attentively studied.

The Fifth Chapter we regard as an extremely important one. It tends to disencumber the subject of the Scripture miracles of a vast mass of extraneous matter, by establishing this position ;—that, in proving their truth, it is unnecessary to draw a strict line of distinction between true and false pretensions to miracles. We have here a principle highly valuable, as offering essential relief to many minds, which labour under the weight of questions connected with the whole history of ecclesiastical miracles. It is asserted by Middleton and Gibbon, that the claim of miracles has been equally confident in all ages of the church, from the first of the fathers, to the last of the popes. The assertion, whether false or true, was no doubt insidiously directed against the credit of the Scripture miracles themselves. But it may be very safely maintained, on the principles of Mr. Penrose, that their credit does not require the disproof of that assertion. In our inquiries respecting them, we need not suffer ourselves to be embarrassed for a moment, by disputes concerning the truth of any superhuman occurrences alleged to have happened since. It may be difficult, indeed, to draw, before hand, a broad and vigorous line of demarcation, which shall obviously separate all true miracles from all fraudulent wonders. But yet, it may not be difficult to see, whether a particular fact is at a great distance, even from the most ill defined boundary, whether on the right side or the wrong. Now this, we contend, to be precisely the case with the miracles recorded in Scripture. They occupy a position of their own.

They do not stand near the border territory. They are quite clear of the debateable land. Let the evidence required for the establishment of a miracle be fixed at the very highest point warranted by the best authenticated cases in ecclesiastical history—still the wonderful works of Scripture will be found to stand on an elevation incomparably more commanding. They are far out of the reach of disturbance from any debate, which may arise in the regions below them, between the partisans and the adversaries of all other pretensions.

In this chapter the author is led to notice, with just disapprobation, the prejudice which is ready, almost without inquiry, to fix a mark of discredit on all miracles whatever, except those recorded in Scripture. There can be no doubt, that such claims to miraculous power should be scrutinized with the severest jealousy. But still, we are scarcely warranted to get rid of them all by one sweeping rejection, on the ground so commonly taken; namely, that frequent miracles would confound the order of nature, and disable us from pronouncing whether Moses or Jesus Christ had performed any thing which could invest them with supernatural authority. If miracles, indeed, were to hold divided empire with ordinary occurrences, they must, of course, soon lose their distinctive character. But it is difficult to imagine what confusion could arise from an almost perpetual current of preternatural agency, running constantly in some particular direction, through the wide regions of God's general Providence. Let us suppose, for instance, that the power of working miracles were at this day, undoubtedly and exclusively, attached to the teachers of Christianity. The most prodigal exercise of such power, by this one order of men, could never impair the force or the distinctness of that standing evidence. There can, therefore, be no ground for concluding that miracles have been discontinued, because, by their continuance, their efficacy would *necessarily* have been destroyed. See p. 297, &c.

The Sixth and last Chapter relates to the claims upon our attention, belonging to alleged miracles not recorded in Scripture. This inquiry, as we have already seen, is by no means necessary to the defence of Christianity. Nevertheless it is an inquiry of great interest and importance; and—it may be added—of formidable difficulty and complication, if pursued in all its details. Fortunately, however, there are some considerations by which it may be reduced within a moderate and manageable compass. The practical “question is, not whether we can put a general negative on all claims of miracles except those of Scripture, but whether those claims assume a shape, or a seriousness, which reasonably entitles them to regard and attention. Till cause be

shown, why any subject should be examined, we are authorized to *neglect*, even though we should be unprepared to *refute*, the particular evidence, or the facts alleged in it.”—(p. 305.) Why, for instance, should men waste their existence in weighing and measuring the vast mass of testimony, which has filled the world with the prodigies of witchcraft, or with veracious and delectable histories of apparitions? Why, even, should they be counting the grains of that scanty and precarious evidence which ascribes miraculous power to the truly pious missionary Xavier. Either the end, for which miracles are said to have been wrought, must be important, or the attestation to them must be weighty, before they can reasonably challenge our attention. If these presumptions are wanting, we may fairly relieve ourselves from the duty of any inquiry on the subject.

On the other hand, we must be watchful against a rash and hasty disregard of miraculous stories; for such precipitation may betray us into the pernicious sophistry of Hume; who certainly was guilty of an atrocious contempt of all good logic in affirming, that because many such accounts are false, none can be true. The proper corrective of this wretched fallacy is to be found in a note of Mr. Penrose, the substance of which may be stated thus. The *general* improbability of miracles is undoubtedly very great; but this improbability, great as it is, never can amount to a *certainty* that *all* miracles are, *without exception*, false. The *general* improbability that human testimony should be fallacious, may, perhaps, be slight: but this improbability is capable under some circumstances of being converted into a moral certainty, that, in a particular instance, the testimony is true. To argue from the general improbability of any class of occurrences, to the universal certainty of their falsehood, is, manifestly, illegitimate. But there is nothing illogical in proceeding, even from a considerable probability of their falsehood in ordinary cases, to the positive certainty of their truth in very extraordinary ones. We have here a distinction of immense importance. It looks very plausible to say, that miracles are highly improbable, while the deceitfulness of human testimony is notorious; and, on the strength of this vague and general comparison, to reject all accounts of supernatural agency. But the above considerations effectually unmufile this precious sophism. They enable us to see, that there may be cases, in which the miracle is not improbable, while the testimony is absolutely conclusive. (See note A to p. 16.)

But we are compelled to bring our remarks to a close. We have dealt chiefly in commendation of this work, and have now left ourselves no room, even if there were any serious occasion for censure. We abstain from a useless notice of subordinate positions and statements, here and there, which might, perhaps, be

capable of improvement or limitation. We regard the work as a very valuable accession to English Theology, and could wish that its style were somewhat more popular, in order that it might have the fullest possible chance of general usefulness. Those readers who shrink from any serious demand on their patience and exertion, will, perhaps, on the first perusal of it, be apt to think that they have got hold of a very hard book. They certainly will have got hold of a book that requires a sustained application of their faculties: and it is possible that the author might, in some slight degree, have lightened their toil by a little more attention to the useful artifices of composition. But it must be remembered that the subject is a grave and severe one; and those persons can have no very vivid regard for truth, who are unwilling to do such treatises as this the justice of repeated perusal. It is no mean privilege to possess, within a reasonable compass, the result of laborious and independent thought, honestly devoted, for a series of years, to questions of the most sacred importance.

ART. IV.—*An Historical View of the Plea of Tradition, as maintained in the Church of Rome, &c. &c.* By George Miller, D.D. &c. &c. 8vo. 4s. London. Rivington.

AMONG the defenders of the pure Christian Religion, whose exertions have been called forth by renewed attempts of Popery against the Protestant Church in these countries, we are happy to number the able and learned Doctor MILLER. The various literary works, by which this eminent man has benefited society, bear so clearly the stamp of genius; his historical lectures, particularly, contain so much useful information, and interesting novelty of thought; and his "Observations" lately published, "on the Doctrines of Christianity, in reference to Arianism, and on the Athanasian Creed," are so excellent, that we opened his last publication, which now lies before us, with confident anticipations of its value. Our expectation has been realized.

Our space must confine us to a brief and general description of the nature of the contents of Doctor MILLER's publication. We refer our readers for more particular information to the valuable tract itself. The author, following a course, novel in the revived controversy with the Romish Church, proposes "to examine *as a question of history*, the tradition alleged by the Church of Rome in support of its peculiar tenets, to investigate the opinions of those ecclesiastical writers, from age to age, who have been referred to in the controversy, and thus to trace the history of the plea." (p. 1, 2.) The immediate occasion of Doctor Miller's publica-

tion was furnished by a resolution which certain Roman Catholics adopted in a meeting at Carlow in the last Summer, and by an exhortation, which Dr. Doyle, titular bishop of Kildare and Leighlin, subsequently addressed to the Romish Clergy of Carlow and its vicinity. The purport of the Resolution, and of Dr. Doyle's exhortation, "has," (says our author,) "been, not simply to assert that the revelation of our Saviour has been transmitted to us, partly by the sacred Scriptures, and partly by tradition; and that therefore it is not sufficient for a Christian to seek in the Scriptures a knowledge of his religion; but to represent tradition as the indispensable interpreter of those Scriptures, and as giving authority to the meaning which it shall pronounce to be true."

The result of Dr. Miller's examination of the history of the plea of tradition, for the details of which we must refer to his work, is summed up by him in the following words:

"Such appears to have been the history of that tradition, which is now maintained by Roman Catholics in Ireland, as indispensably necessary to the just interpretation of the sacred writings. Apparently unknown to the Apostolic Fathers, who might naturally be supposed to have been inclined to announce their possession of a deposit so important to the Church, and so creditable to themselves; it is discovered, first, among the *gnostic* heretics, who in the affectation of a superior knowledge of divine things had corrupted the simplicity of the Gospel with many inventions, which required some other sanction than the authority of the Scriptures. It was then adopted from *them* by two fathers of the Church (Irenæus and Tertullian;) but only to repel the arguments of those who had first pleaded against the Scriptures a spurious tradition, and had then so falsified the records of Christianity, as to embarrass any inference from their genuine communications. When this use had been made of the argument, it seems to have been felt that such an appeal was incongruous and unnecessary, for it was immediately abandoned by the Church, nor does it appear to have been resumed in the great controversy of *Arianism* by either party for the support of their tenets. After an interruption of almost two centuries and a half among the western Christians, and in Greece of the much longer period of more than five centuries and a half; we again find tradition pleaded as an authority; but in each case for a *practice*, not for a *doctrine*; each practice, also, plainly condemned by the written word. The argument was then abandoned, and each plea disowned by one of the two Churches, until the very crisis of the reformation, when it was once more brought forward, to oppose the appeal which the reformers had made to the Scriptures; and as these reformers had objected to doctrines, not less than to practices, the tradition of the Church was then, for the first time,* pleaded in favour of doctrines.

* Dr. Miller of course means, for the first time with the authority of the Church: for some individuals, (*Scotus* among them) had attempted to defend certain new points of faith, as declared by the Lateran Council, by the aid of alleged tradition; "and thus," says Stillingfleet, "*Scotus* helped himself out in the dark point of transubstantiation."

Even then, however, in the very agony of the papal power, it was not pleaded that the Scripture was not intelligible without the aid of tradition, the latter being represented only as entitled to equal reverence, and not as a superior and controlling authority for divine truth. This last step was taken about the close of the sixteenth century, by Cardinal *Bellarmino*, who in his too candid defence of the Church of Rome, did not hesitate to maintain, that the gospel, without unwritten tradition, is an empty name, or words without sense. The Roman Catholics of Ireland, imitating the boldness of the Cardinal, have declared, that the Scriptures are not intelligible without the aid of tradition." (p. 65, 67.)

Though some of the facts here stated, have been adverted to by Stillingfleet, Ellys, and others, in a former period of the controversy; and that relating to Cardinal *Bellarmino* has been well dwelt on by Bishop Marsh, in his "Comparative View;" (p. 15, 16.) yet, the history possesses much novelty and interest; and is, perhaps, the only regular historic view of the subject, which we have. We thank Dr. Miller for this his new service; and recommend his book to the attention of the public. We feel no small degree of pleasure in expressing gratitude to this distinguished Divine, for his zealous and able exertions.

Dr. Miller's appendix to his "Historical View of the Plea of Tradition" contains interesting extracts from original authorities.

ART. V.—1. *A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Derby, at the Visitations at Derby and Chesterfield, June 22 and 23, 1825; and published at their request.* By the Rev. S. Butler, D.D. F.R.S. &c. Archdeacon of Derby, and Head Master of Shrewsbury School. London, Longman & Co. 1826.

2. *A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Derby, at the Visitations at Derby and Chesterfield, June 15, and 16, 1826; and published at their request.* By the Rev. S. Butler, D.D. F.R.S. &c. Archdeacon of Derby, and Head Master of Shrewsbury School. London, Longman & Co. 1826.

THE information comprised in the first of these charges is so shortly and clearly stated, and may prove so highly useful as a pattern for others to follow, and as part of a general survey of the present state of our Church Establishment, that we transcribe it entire from the Archdeacon's pages.

"The Archdeaconry of Derby is, as you know, commensurate with the county, and divided into three deaneries, Derby, Ashbourne, and Chesterfield. There are, however, about thirty churches, which, being either peculiar or donative, are not under archidiaconal jurisdiction. The greatest part of these lie in the north-western side of the county, from about Bakewell, towards Buxton and Ashbourne.

"Of the remainder, being 163 parishes, there are, in the deanery of Derby, 91; in that of Ashbourne, 21; and in that of Chesterfield, 51 churches.

"These are divided into rectories, vicarages, or chapels and curacies.

| | |
|---|--|
| "Of these there are in the deanery of Derby | 27 rectories, 30 vicarages, 34 curacies. |
|---|--|

91

| | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| "In that of Ashbourne | 9 rectories, 3 vicarages, 9 curacies. |
|---------------------------------|---|

21

| | |
|------------------------------------|--|
| "In that of Chesterfield | 16 rectories, 19 vicarages, 16 curacies. |
|------------------------------------|--|

51

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| "In all | 52 rectories, 52 vicarages, 59 curacies and chapels. |
|-------------------|--|

163

"There are also three or four small chapels on some parochial townships within the archdeaconry, which, being served only once a fortnight, or even less frequently, by the incumbent, or curate of the mother church, and not being entered in the process paper, I have not taken into the present account.

"The whole income of these 163 churches, according to the returns I have received, and which I believe are tolerably correct, being divided by the whole number of churches, gives an income of 239*l.* for each, omitting fractions of pence and shillings;—but as four of the churches are consolidated, their number is reduced in fact to 159, instead of 163; and thus the average income of each church is raised to very near 245*l.*; a sum which may be considered as not much differing from the average value of churches throughout the kingdom.

"Of these 159 livings, for so many we must call them, for the reason I have already assigned, there are

| | | |
|----|---|-----|
| 23 | of or above the value of 500 <i>l</i> . | |
| 10 | from 400 <i>l</i> . to | 500 |
| 15 | — 300 | 400 |
| 19 | — 200 | 300 |
| 12 | — 150 | 200 |
| 31 | — 100 | 150 |
| 30 | — 50 | 100 |
| 19 | not exceeding | 50 |

159

"Of these, 58 are above the average of 245*l*., and 101 below it. The tithes of 90 churches, being considerably more than one-half the number in the archdeaconry, are in the hands of lay improPRIATORS ;— and those of 18 more, though in ecclesiastical hands, are not in those of the incumbent of the church to which they belong.

"These 159 livings, comprising 163 churches, are served by 135 clergymen, either as incumbents or curates : For 28 churches, being for the most part chapels of ease, are served by the incumbent or curate of the mother church, or by the minister of a neighbouring parish.

"Of the above 163 churches, 91 have houses fit for the residence of a clergyman ; 20 have houses, but unfit for the residence of a clergyman ; and, indeed, nearly all these last-mentioned are mere cottages, just capable of accommodating a labourer and his family ; and 52 have no house. So that, in fact, there are 72 churches which virtually have no place of residence for their minister.

"On the 91 livings which have houses, there are resident 60 incumbents, and 21 curates. In the remaining 10 cases, in which neither incumbent nor curate appear resident, the incumbent, generally, is so virtually ; either living in his own house in the parish, instead of the parsonage, and doing himself the duty, or residing on an adjoining living, and doing also the duty of that on which he does not reside.

"Of the 20 livings which have no fit houses, and the 52 which have no house at all, many are of small value ; and being themselves insufficient for the support of a clergyman, and of small population, requiring only single duty, are served by the curate or incumbent of a neighbouring parish. There are, however, 5 of these which have their incumbent, and 5 which have their curate resident in the parish ; and of the remaining 62, the duty, in 39 cases, is performed by the incumbent himself.

"There were educated, in schools connected with the church establishment, at the time my survey was completed, 11,759 children ; but owing, I hope in some degree to my own previous recommendations, and no doubt much more to the zeal and earnestness with which our able and excellent diocesan has taken up the subject during his last year's visitation, I trust this number, large as it appears, is now considerably augmented.

“At the time of my own survey there were 29 parishes, containing 14,000 inhabitants, without any school whatever.

“I cannot but press this, my Reverend Brethren, most seriously upon your attention. In an age of all others the most experimental, and, I may add, the most impatient of moral and religious restraint and discipline, it is of the utmost importance, if possible, to stem the torrent of infidelity and licentiousness, by giving a right direction to the minds of the rising generation, and making those early impressions in favour of genuine and practical religion, which are, of all others, the most likely to be permanent.”—*First Charge*, p. 1—9.

The second charge refers to a much more difficult and delicate question,—the extent to which the education of the lower orders may be advantageously and safely carried. Archdeacon Butler describes the possible dangers of the experiment with his usual ability, and perhaps he overrates them; but the corrective suggested in the following admirable passage places the question in its proper light.

“I am aware that the example of our northern fellow-subjects may be, and often is alleged, as a proof of the advantages of diffused education, and far be it from me to undervalue or depreciate their merits. But I must be allowed to observe, that if they are distinguished for sobriety, quietness, and industry in time of peace; and, let me add, for courage and discipline in time of war; the cause is not so much to be looked for in the diffusion of general knowledge, as in the general attention which is paid in that country to religious education. This is the great and essential cause of their national civilization, and this is the point, my Reverend Brethren, to which I anxiously wish to draw your attention. If education is to be diffused as widely as possible, let it be *thus* directed, and it cannot fail to produce good effects. But if it is *not* thus regulated, and much more, if it is *entirely withdrawn* from this great object, to philosophical dogmas or abstract speculations, we cannot expect that it will produce substantial good. With this object in view, it will make men better citizens, better neighbours, better parents, better husbands, better friends. It will teach them to be sober, diligent, patient and content. It will give them not only clearer views of their duties, but nobler motives to fulfil them. It will not only enlighten their understandings, but purify their hearts. This is knowledge which cannot be too widely spread; this must produce happiness to all; to those who give, to those who receive, and to those who practise it. This takes no man from his proper sphere, interferes with no useful calling, occupies none in frivolous speculations, or unnecessary pursuits—administers to no folly—creates no discontent. This, then, my Brethren, is what I most earnestly recommend to your attention. That you, who, as pastors of the flocks committed to your care, are required to see that none be lost, be diligent especially to train up the rising generation in the fear of God, and the knowledge of their Christian duties.

“The advocates of general education say, that the spirit is gone forth, and who shall stop it? Who, my Brethren, would seek to stop it, while it is not productive of harm, or can be made productive of good? Who would seek to stop it, while it is merely directed even to purposes of rational instruction or amusement? Considered as an experiment for these purposes, no one can wish it ill. But experiments in uncautious hands are never free from hazard, and, in other sciences besides that of medicine, are often fraught with the most perilous consequences. They may be undertaken by the ignorant or unwary, but the remedy for the mischief they occasion is often beyond the skill of the experienced and the wise. They are like the letting out of water, which is not always safe or salutary: if it is directed in its proper channels, it may nourish the plants, and make the earth bring forth abundantly; if it is suffered to flow without restraint, where it ought to refresh and invigorate, it may inundate and destroy. Be it our part, then, my Reverend Brethren, as far as we can, to direct its course; and if the spirit of learning has gone forth irresistibly into the world, let us avail ourselves of it for the best and holiest purposes. Let us recollect, as I observed on a former occasion, that as long as we have an established national Church, no education but that which is in conformity with its liturgy and doctrines can be strictly national. Let us remember that we are the appointed teachers in that Church, and let us endeavour to be at least as faithful in *our* office, as the ministers of other congregations, which dissent from us, are in *theirs*. I do not mean that we should seek to make converts and proselytes, or interfere with the religious instruction which men of other persuasions give their children, but that we should endeavour to keep those who *do* belong to us, steadfast in *their* faith, by giving them such early lessons of piety, and such instructive explanations of what the Gospel requires them to believe and do, as may remain with them through their lives.

“Above all, my Brethren, while we form their tender minds, and inculcate precept upon precept, and line upon line, let us not only be careful to do this with all diligence and all patience; but let us inforce our instructions and sanctify our precepts by our own example; thus, and thus only, may we hope to succeed in our endeavours. If we thus sow the seed of religious knowledge in the youthful mind, and thus water it, God will give the increase; with his blessing we shall reap the fruits, and our own labour will not have been in vain in the Lord.”

ART. VI.—*Boast not thyself of to-morrow: a Sermon, preached at Middle Claydon Church, at the Funeral of General Sir Harry Calvert, Bart. G.C.B. and Lieutenant-Governor of Chelsea Hospital, who died at Claydon House, Bucks, after an illness of eight hours, Sept. 4, 1826.* By the Rev. Henry Blunt, A.M. Vicar of Clare, Suffolk; Curate of Chelsea, Middlesex; alternate Evening Preacher at the Philanthropic Society; and late Fellow of Pembroke College, Cambridge. Svo. 1s. London. John Hatchard and Son. 1826.

WE extract what appears to us the most important passage in this discourse.

“ When I say that I trust our dear departed friend was prepared, you have a right to ask me why I venture such an assertion; this is not the place and not the time to make light assertions upon a subject so solemn and important. I will then tell you why I say so; it is not because I believe him, as I most assuredly do, to have been a man of the *most perfect integrity* and the *most inflexible uprightness and consciousness*, in all the duties between man and man, *blameless*; it is not because I have known him minister largely to the wants of others, and sympathize most deeply and most feelingly with them in their distress; it is not because I have myself seen, since this sad event has happened, the tears gush from the widow’s eyes, and have beheld the sorrows of the poor whom his Christian kindness had deeply and dearly attached to him; it is not because we may without one grain of flattery, and without one word of exaggerated praise, say of him, as was said of Job, “ When the ear heard him, then it blessed him, when the eye saw him, then it gave witness to him; because he delivered the poor that cried, and the fatherless and him that had none to help him. The blessing of him that was *ready to perish* came upon him, and he caused the widow’s heart to sing for joy.” These are features in the character of him for whom we mourn, to which we may look back with feelings of melancholy pleasure, and to which, I confess, I do advert with sensations of sincere delight; but it is not for any, or for all of these, that I would speak of him as of one prepared to meet his God: no! highly as I respect and value and love charities and virtues such as these, I dare not magnify them thus: I dare not say that they could ever qualify a sinful, fallen creature, such as man, even in his best estate, to stand acquitted in the presence of a perfectly pure and holy God: no, my brethren, our noblest charities, our holiest deeds are mingled with sin; instead of forming a plea for mercy, they themselves need repenting of, they themselves require washing in the blood of Christ to render them even acceptable to God. When I say I trust he was prepared for this awful, this unexpected summons, I ground it upon the firm belief that he had fled for refuge to the hope set before him in the gospel, that he had been brought to the vital knowledge of himself as a sinner, and of Jesus Christ as his only Saviour and Deliverer: that he had cast off every

dependence upon himself, and had come in sincere repentance and deep consciousness of his sins, and of his need of a free and full forgiveness, to the cross of his Redeemer. This, and this alone, is the ground of my assertion; all the virtues and all the charities of life are nothing in the sight of God, except they are the fruits of a true and living faith, except they proceed from a heart renewed by the spirit of grace, and truly reconciled to God by the death of his Son. And even then, valuable and *absolutely necessary* as they are, as evidences of our belief, it is not to them that we look for our acquittal, our acceptance with God; it is to the blood of the everlasting covenant, and to that alone. It is this lively interest in the blood of the Redeemer, this "being one with Christ and Christ with us," which alone can give a man peace at the last, and enable us to be "presented faultless in the presence of His glory with exceeding joy."—p. 13—16.

There are several objections to this passage. Mr. Blunt proposes to tell us why he trusts that the highly respected person, at whose funeral this discourse was delivered, was prepared to meet his God. And from all that we had known or heard of the late Sir Harry Calvert, we should have imagined, that the preacher had undertaken a very easy task. Sir Harry Calvert passed a long life in the serious, open profession of the Christian faith; he was a constant attendant at public worship, and a regular partaker of the appointed means of grace. His actions were not inconsistent with his profession. In private he was a kind and faithful friend, a tender and vigilant parent, and was remarkable for purity of morals, and strict sobriety of conduct. His official services are known throughout the country; and were never spoken of without praise. He was the unwearied promoter of every thing which could improve the religious and moral character of his fellow-soldiers, and his labours were crowned with no inconsiderable portion of success, because they were temperate, and wise.

Might we not, therefore, have expected to be told concerning such a man, that his truly Christian conduct established the reality of his Christian character: that his faith was proved by his works; and that, as far as mortals could see or know, he lived a sincere, and died a happy disciple of his Saviour? Mr. Blunt expresses himself in very different language. He mentions the virtues of the deceased, in terms which are theoretically correct; and which it would have been quite proper to address to the living man, if he was supposed to rely upon his works; or to his mourning relations, if they were understood to think that he was entitled to the joys of heaven as a reward. But these points were not under consideration. The preacher was stating his own reason for trusting that a departed friend was blessed; and he grounds it upon a firm belief "that he had been brought to a

vital knowledge of himself as a sinner, and of Jesus Christ as his only Saviour and deliverer; that he had cast off every dependence upon himself, and had come in sincere repentance, and deep consciousness of his sins, and of his need of a free and full forgiveness, to the cross of his Redeemer. This, and this alone, is the ground of my assertion." And this might be said as truly of a mere death-bed penitent, as of one who had proved the sincerity of his repentance, by a long course of holy living. We admit, that if the sentiments so justly attributed to this individual, were not entertained by him, his religion was nothing worth; but they might have been entertained by him without rendering his condition secure; and Mr. Blunt's belief that they were entertained, must rest at last upon those very facts which he refuses to take into consideration. Works, he confesses, are "*absolutely necessary as evidences of our belief*;" and yet when inquiring into the reality of a man's belief, he sets these evidences aside, and refers us to his own private conviction that the deceased was a true Christian. There is a strange inconsistency in this mode of reasoning; and we are sorry to see it adopted by so respectable and zealous a preacher as Mr. Blunt.

ART. VII.—*A Popular Introduction to the Study of the Holy Scriptures, for the Use of English Readers.* By William Carpenter. Illustrated with Maps and Plates. 8vo. 16s. London. 1826.

OUR attention has been directed to this volume with some degree of curiosity, in consequence of the assiduity with which it has been advertised in different periodical journals for the last two or three months, with a declaration "that it will not interfere with any existing work." We were not aware of "any existing work," to which the compiler of the volume now under consideration could allude, except the Bishop of Winchester's "Introduction to the Study of the Bible," and Mr. HARTWELL HORNE'S "Introduction to the Critical Study and Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures." The former is an admirable manual, comprising almost every thing which "English Readers" could require; and at the same time containing the result of so much learned research, that the scholar may with pleasure recur to it, to revive his recollections. But this manual Mr. Carpenter does not appear to have seen. On comparing his book, however, with Mr. Horne's work, the mystery was solved at sight: for so close is the resemblance between these publications, that the two Sosias

(with whose feats the daily journals have told us the public has been so highly diverted) are not more alike than is Mr. Carpenter's book to Mr. Horne's Introduction, in the mode of printing, the *arrangement* of a considerable part of the work, the identity of references to English authors, and the exhibition of the same quotations from the same authors, (in one or two instances with Mr. Horne's *numeration of paragraphs*;) and in the same order and for the same purpose with which Mr. Horne has given them. On a more minute collation, suspicion was converted into certainty; and our deliberate conviction is, that the book which bears the name of Mr. Carpenter, is as artful a piece of plagiarism, as it ever fell to the lot of a critic to expose; and of plagiarism not exclusively confined to Mr. Horne (though the second, third, and fourth volumes of his Introduction are principally concerned :) for we have detected passages ostensibly given as direct quotations from English authors, which, we are pretty certain, from actual comparison, have been taken at second hand (if we may use such an expression) from OTHER writers who have given the *same* quotation, the *same* reference, and on the same subject; but with this difference, that the writers alluded to have printed their quotations *bonâ fide* as such, with quotation commas; while Mr. Carpenter has appropriated the passages in question to himself, without indicating in any way their beginning, conclusion, or extent, and in some instances without any reference to the pages which he professes to quote. We will now state some of the evidence which has led us to this conclusion, and our readers shall judge for themselves.

The first part of Mr. Carpenter's book contains directions for reading the Holy Scriptures: and in almost the first page of his Preface, he has taken, with one alteration, the title of Mr. Horne's observations on the same subject. The commencement of Mr. Horne's Introduction (first edition, or the last chapter of Vol. I. of subsequent impressions,) is "On the MORAL QUALIFICATIONS for studying THE SCRIPTURES." This Mr. Carpenter entitles "THE MORAL QUALIFICATIONS FOR a profitable reading of THE SCRIPTURES." It was stumbling upon this coincidence, at the very outset, that excited our suspicions: and the further we proceeded, those suspicions were progressively confirmed.

The second chapter of Mr. Carpenter's first part comprises rules for reading the Holy Scriptures; in which, besides the literal sense, we have the scope, context, parallel passages, analogy of faith, and practical reading, severally discussed. Mr. Horne has chapters on the same subject, though differently arranged: and here Mr. Carpenter, in one or two instances, quotes Mr. Horne for some matter which was no where else extant; but for-

gets to express his acknowledgments to him for two second-hand quotations, one from Bishop Horsley, and the other from a discourse by Mr. H. T. Burder. The extract from Bishop Horsley occurs in Mr. Horne's chapter on *parallel passages*, and he refers to his "Nine Sermons on the Resurrection, &c. pp. 221—228." Mr. Carpenter omits one sentence, and also a few dots which Mr. Horne had given to show that he had omitted some sentences; and Mr. Carpenter has printed, as *one entire quotation*, what Mr. Horne had, by quotation commas, distinguished as taken from *several pages* of Bishop Horsley, even to a little dash — which is not in the Bishop's volume: and Mr. C. cites *Nine Sermons*, p. 121, &c. Now, we have taken the trouble to compare Mr. Horne with the third edition of the Bishop's Sermons, and we find that his reference *is correct*: and it is evident, that Mr. C. did not consult the book in question, from the vague reference he has made to the title, and from his referring to "*p. 121, &c.*" where the passage he pretends to cite is *not* to be found: for that passage is the commencement of Bishop Horsley's Four Sermons on the Evidence of our Lord's Resurrection. So again, in the extract alluded to, from Mr. Burder, Mr. Carpenter gives the *same* quotation on the *same subject* as Mr. H. had done, and then gravely tells us, "since the above was written, I have met with the following judicious remarks, of which I gladly avail myself," &c. &c., when the very passage was before him, at the time he copied from Mr. Horne this sentence, (to his very italics,)—"The scope of an author is either *general* or *special*."! Can any one believe that such a coincidence is purely accidental? especially when we add that Professor Franck's Guide to the Study of the Holy Scriptures, to which Mr. Carpenter professes to refer, *has no such sentence*. But we hasten to more important instances.

Part II. of Mr. Carpenter's volume treats on what he calls "Helps towards a right Understanding of Scripture." On the nature and sources of those "helps" he has many things in common with Mr. Horne, which show most clearly that the Introduction was before him when he wrote: for we find him introducing the *same* quotation from an old author, and upon the *same subject*:—Though he refers to a different edition, he is evidently indebted to Mr. H. for the authority. In one instance he takes a long paragraph (nearly an entire page) for which he refers to Mr. Horne's fourth edition, but gives no quotation commas to mark the extent of his obligation; and *after* he has given his reference, he, without acknowledgment, takes from a subsequent page the names of certain authors, whose works Mr. H. had indicated as worthy of perusal. But it is in the "Prefatory Ob-

servations on the several Books of Scripture," that we find the sweeping use that has been made of Mr. H.'s labours. He disposes his prefatory observations on the several books of Scripture, as any of our readers may see on referring to the contents of his fourth volume under the heads of *Author, date, genuineness; and authenticity—occasion, scope or design* (he uses these words indifferently), and *analysis of its contents*. No other English writer exactly pursues this order, but the foreign authors whom Mr. H. has consulted *do follow it*; and so does Mr. Carpenter, without acknowledgment: for he tells his readers (p. 57) that he proceeds "to notice in order the several books of the Scriptures, and to furnish such information respecting their *authors—dates—titles—scope or design—authenticity and contents* as is requisite for attaining a proper knowledge of the respective matters treated of in them."

Scarcely a page occurs, in this portion of Mr. Carpenter's book in which we have not found several lines taken verbatim, in some instances to Mr. Horne's very italics: and in one instance, Mr. Horne's *peculiar* order of arranging the prophetic books is taken without any acknowledgment! Mr. H. divides the prophets into three classes, viz. "The Prophets who flourished before the Babylonian captivity"—"The Prophets who flourished near to and during the Babylonian captivity;" and "the Prophets who flourished after the return of the Jews from Babylon;" and he treats "on the Book of the Prophet Jonah," Amos, &c. &c. (vol. iv. pp. 147—211 of the fourth edition, or vol. ii. pp. 237—320 of the first edition.) Our readers shall now see how closely Mr. Carpenter has imitated Mr. Horne's order, in pp. 108 to 134. "I. Prophets who flourished PRIOR TO the Babylonish captivity." "II. Prophets who flourished near to and during the Babylonish captivity;" and "III. Prophets who flourished after the return from Babylon." Our readers will here observe that Mr. Carpenter has altered BABYLONIAN into BABYLONISH, and has substituted "prior to" for "before." We should not have dwelt on this seemingly trifling circumstance; but that we do not remember to have seen the prophets so arranged by any English writer. The only English authors whom Mr. Carpenter *professes* to cite: viz. Dr. Gray, Dr. A. Clarke, Dr. Gill, and Bishop Tomline, (whose *Elements of Theology* we suspect he cites at second hand from Mr. Horne,) have *no such order*. The truth is, that no English writer has so arranged the prophets before Mr. H. whose order Mr. C. has taken for *nearly thirty closely printed pages*, without any indication of the source to which he is indebted for his method.

We now come to direct instances of passages palpably taken

from Mr. Horne and other writers, without acknowledgment. In vol. iv. p. 11. Mr. Horne has enumerated the types of the Messiah; Mr. Carpenter also presents several "types of the Messiah," giving the same identical types, the same references, the same italics, the same semicolons. He has added, indeed, the word *tabernacled*, as being the English of the Greek word of St. John, which was referred to by Mr. H. But with the exception of this single word, the passage is from Mr. Horne without acknowledgment, and without considering whether all the subjects so indicated as types were really typical of the Messiah. The tabernacle is clearly no type of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; St. John's language only alluded to it. Mr. Horne, in his fifth edition, has very properly expunged this; but Mr. Carpenter has copied Mr. H.'s fourth edition verbatim et punctuatum, without stopping to consider whether every thing there stated was strictly applicable. The introductory remark on the title of Deuteronomy is palpably altered from Mr. Horne, the heads of part of whose analysis of that book are taken. We also recognize from Mr. Horne whole sentences interwoven in Mr. Carpenter's prefaces to the several books of Joshua, Judges, Kings, Chronicles, and Job. On the book of Psalms we find Mr. C. copying part of Mr. Horne's quotation from Bishop Horsley, On the *Structure* of the Psalms, and with the very same reference "Bp. Horsley's Psalms, vol. i. p. xvi."! On the book of Ecclesiastes Mr. Carpenter affects to quote (but without quotation commas) Mr. Holden's learned and well executed "Attempt to illustrate the Book of Ecclesiastes," "Prelim. Discourse, p. lxxv." for what is NOT there. In vol. iv. p. 122, Mr. Horne, having given with *quotation commas* an extract from Mr. Holden's work, cites *correctly* "Prelim. Diss. pp. lxxv. lxxviii—lxxii:" and the whole of Mr. Carpenter's Synopsis of Ecclesiastes is substantially the same as in Mr. Horne's volume; only Mr. C. has run together the subjects of the several sections; and the titles or subjects of the two parts which Mr. Horne has printed in small capital letters, Mr. Carpenter has printed in italics. We should not have mentioned these particulars; but the fact is, that these titles, (*which are found in Mr. Horne's work*), viz.

"PART I. The Vanity of all earthly Conditions, Occupations, and Pleasures.

"PART II. The Nature, Excellence, and beneficial Effects of Wisdom or Religion."—

These titles, we repeat, do NOT exist in Mr. Holden's *Analytical Table of Contents*, NOR in his *paraphrase*. He mentions them, indeed, in his Preliminary Dissertation. Mr. Horne has supplied them in his work; whence Mr. Carpenter has mutilated Mr.

Horne's Analysis, copying however all the *parentheses* in which he had inclosed the references to the book of Ecclesiastes, and which parentheses do not exist in Mr. Holden's Book. But we must leave Mr. Horne a little, to point out Mr. Carpenter's obligations to another author, who has distinguished himself by the scrupulous fidelity with which he has indicated passages *bonâ fide* cited by him—we mean Dr. ADAM CLARKE.

In the preface to his commentary on Isaiah, (p. v.) he thus expresses himself:

"On the style of the prophets much has been said by several learned men, particularly, Calmet, Lowth, Bishop Newton, Vitringa, Michaelis, Houbigant. Their chief observations, and especially those most within the reach of the common people, have been selected and abridged with great care and industry by the Rev. Dr. John Smith, of Cambleton, in his little tract intituled "A Summary View and Explanation of the Writings of the Prophets," to which it forms preliminary observations."

We will now give Mr. Carpenter's observations on this topic, requesting our readers to compare the words, which, in both extracts, we have printed in italics.

"On the style of the prophets much has been written, particularly by Calmet, Lowth, Vitringa, Michaelis, and Newton. From the preliminary observations to Dr. Smith's "View of the Prophets," &c. where the principal observations of these learned writers have been abridged with great judgment, the following remarks have been selected. (p. 95.)

The coincidence in these two passages is too obvious to need any remark: we will only add, that Dr. Clarke has given Dr. Smith's quotations, with the accustomed marks, to show the extent of *his* obligations: and that Mr. Carpenter has given the same passages from Dr. Smith, amounting to some eighteen or twenty pages, but without any mark to indicate the beginning, conclusion, or extent of his quotation. He found the passage cited by Dr. Clarke; he takes Dr. C.'s introductory remarks, *as his own*, and, guided by the Doctor's research, he goes to the same source and gives the same passage from the same or some other edition of Dr. Smith's book. But this is not the only instance in which Mr. Carpenter has been indebted to Dr. Clarke without acknowledgment. His analysis of the prophecy of Isaiah, according to Vitringa, in p. 114, is taken from the Doctor's Preface already alluded to, with a few alterations. Before we quit Isaiah, we must remark, that in noticing the style of that Prophet, Mr. C. (p. 113) has taken an entire paragraph verbatim from Mr. Horne's 4th volume, p. 165, without any quotation marks; which he has blended with two pages taken, also verbatim, from Dr. Gray's "Key," to which he refers with "*p. 368, &c.*" but without indicating how much he owes to that learned Divine. Mr. Horne's arrangement of the prophecies of Jere-

miah, after Dr. Blayney, is copied verbatim with his introductory and concluding remarks.

But we must hasten to the New Testament. In p. 142 we find Mr. Carpenter introducing a long extract from Bishop Marsh's translation of Michaelis, (Vol. III. Part I. pp. 40—85,) with some remarks, ostensibly his own, but almost verbatim from Dr. Clarke. We will first give the Dr.'s words.

"The following harmonized Table of Contents of the four Gospels I have borrowed from Professor Michaelis, Introduction to the New Testament, by Dr. Marsh, vol. iii. p. 40, &c., and think it will be of use to the reader in pointing out where the same transaction is mentioned by the evangelists; what they have in common, and what is peculiar to each. The arrangement of facts, as they occur in St. Matthew is here generally followed; and the other evangelists collated with his account." (Comment on four Gospels, signature 4 T. last page.)

Mr. Carpenter, p. 142, expresses himself thus:—

"The following harmonised table of contents of the four Gospels will be found serviceable to the reader, in pointing out where the same transaction is mentioned by the different evangelists. It is taken from Marsh's Translation of Michaelis, "Introduction to the New Testament, vol. iii. p. 40, &c." (We request our readers to note this identity of reference.) "The arrangement of facts as they occur in St. Matthew is here generally followed; and the other evangelists are collated with his account." (p. 142.)

Mr. Carpenter then introduces a short paragraph from Michaelis, which Dr. Clarke has not, and terminates his remarks with the following sentence, which is from Dr. Clarke, with one or two verbal alterations.

"The numbers prefixed to the several sections, point out the consecutive order of the facts, as well as they can be ascertained." (p. 142.)

"The consecutive facts are numbered as nearly as possible, in the supposed chronological order of their occurrence." (Clarke, ut supra.)

The harmonized table of Michaelis then follows. Dr. Clarke has introduced the notes which are in Part II. of Bishop Marsh's translation, at the foot of the page, and has added some short but valuable remarks of his own. Mr. Carpenter also gives the notes of Bishop Marsh at the foot of his page, in the same way that Dr. Clarke has done; thus leading us to suspect that he sent the commentary of the latter to the printer instead of transcribing Michaelis.

In pages 182 to 194 Mr. Carpenter has taken only thirteen closely printed pages, which he calls "An analysis of the four Gospels," from Mr. Townsend's arrangement of the New Testament, (vol. ii. pp. 740 to 753,) with one of his very modest etceras—"Vol. ii. p. 741, &c."

With regard to the Books of the New Testament, (to omit many short unacknowledged passages,) we have to remark, that

some parts of Mr. Horne's observations on the Gospel of St. Matthew are taken verbatim, to his very references; that his account of the tenets of the heresiarch Cerinthus, in vol. iv. pp. 293, 294, is copied by Mr. Carpenter (p. 175), verbatim, to his very *italics*; and that his analysis of the Gospel of St. John, in the following pages, including his reference to Rosenmuller, whose scholia Mr. Carpenter evidently did not consult, is also copied verbatim, as well as his analysis of the same apostle's first epistle, and the very useful canons for interpreting the Apocalypse, which Mr. Horne has abridged in *his own language* from Dr. Woodhouse's translation (now very rare) of that mysterious prophecy, to which work Mr. Horne has correctly referred, but which Mr. Carpenter, as usual, has cited with an &c.

The last portion of Mr. Carpenter's volume treats on biblical antiquities: and here he has made so much use of Mr. Horne's peculiar arrangement, that for *many pages together* the head lines (as we believe they are termed) are identically the same... e. g. *Criminal Law—Military Affairs—Feast of Tabernacles, &c. &c. &c.* Mr. Horne's third volume is wholly devoted to biblical antiquities: it opens with a *sketch* of the historical and physical *geography* of the *Holy Land*; Mr. Carpenter, too, favours us with a *sketch* of sacred *geography*, and in his minor arrangements he pursues Mr. Horne's method of treating the subject. He tells us in a note, that he has adopted, with some slight alterations, the plan laid down by Reland in his *Palestina Illustrata*; availing himself of the materials furnished by the most authentic and recent travellers, concerning the present state of the Holy Land. We doubt this assertion. Not a few of his statements are indeed taken from "The Modern Traveller," a well compiled little work, but we are sure that he did *not* consult the laborious and generally accurate Reland, when he drew up his account of the mountains of Palestine. Reland treats them in this order: Lebanon, Hermon, Carmel, Tabor, Mount of Olives, the mountains of Gilead, Bashan, and other smaller mountains. Mr. Horne also professes to have consulted Reland and the modern travellers. His order is this: *Lebanon*, including Hermon (which recent travellers have shown to be part of the range of Lebanon), Carmel, Tabor, the Mountains of Israel, Gilead, Abarrin, Pisgah, and Nebo. *He* has clearly had Reland before him, and followed his order where it was correct; and how minutely he has compared and digested the narratives of modern travellers any of our readers may judge, who will turn to his Sketch, which is drawn up almost with the precision of an eye witness. Mr. Horne's order, and not seldom, the chief part of his descriptions of the mountains is taken verbatim by Mr. Carpenter; for thus runs *his* enumeration: 1. Lebanon; 2. Carmel; 3. Tabor; 4. The Moun-

tains of Israel or Ephraim; 5. The Mountains of Gilead, Pisgah and Nebo. Can this numerical coincidence be the effect of accident? Mr. Horne, in enumerating the mountains of Palestine, refers to his description of Jerusalem, where he *had given* an account of the mountains which are either within the limits or in the immediate vicinity of that city. Mr. Carpenter refers to his "next section" for a notice of the same mountains!

Mr. Horne's second great division of his third volume is "Political Antiquities of the Jews;" this title is copied verbatim, and Mr. Horne's order (which we have seen in no other English writer before him) is in several instances copied, as well as almost every one of his English references.

In the departments of sacred and domestic antiquities, his order, and frequently the titles of his sections, is taken; not seldom portions of his matter, even to parentheses, which are *not* in the books which Mr. Carpenter has professed to cite.

We had marked many passages, principally from Mr. Horne, but some also from other authors, whose quotations Mr. Carpenter has made free to borrow, without acknowledgment. Not a section of Mr. Horne's work concludes without references to all the authorities consulted by him, among which are numerous foreign works; and on the same subjects Mr. Carpenter as punctually gives similar but mutilated references, always, however, *confining himself to English authorities*. We will subjoin one instance, taken at random. Having given the summary of the Cerinthian heresy, to which we have already adverted, Mr. Horne mentions his authorities in a note to vol. iv. p. 294.

"Mosheim's Commentaries, vol. i. pp. 337—347. Dr. Lardner's Works, 8vo. vol. ix. pp. 325—327.: 4to. vol. iv. pp. 567—569. Dr. Owen's Observations on the Four Gospels, pp. 88—92. To this learned writer we are chiefly indebted for the preceding observations."

Mr. Carpenter, having copied Mr. Horne's 293d and 294th pages verbatim, subjoins the following note, in page 175.

"Mosheim's Commentaries, vol. i. p. 337, &c. Lardner's Works, vol. iv. p. 567, &c. Owen on the Four Gospels, p. 88, &c. And Bishop Percy's Key, p. 58, &c."

This reference to Bishop Percy is merely thrown in to conceal the plagiarism; for that excellent little manual furnishes no additional light upon the subject. What the bishop has said appears to have been borrowed from Dr. Owen (for he cites no authority): and is, besides, printed in a different way; *he* numbers the several articles of the Cerinthian creed—Dr. Owen *does not*. Mr. Horne, who *did* consult Dr. Owen, has condensed all the articles together in the summary he has given; dividing each article with

a hyphen (—), Mr. Carpenter copies Mr. Horne to these very hyphens, garbles his references, and superadds a reference to another writer who does not furnish any new illustration to the subject he pretends to have under discussion.

We could swell this article, already perhaps too long, to double its present extent. From what we have stated, however, we feel assured of the verdict which all candid readers must deliver respecting Mr. Carpenter's book, than which a grosser instance of plagiarism has never fallen under our cognizance. Mr. Carpenter does not pretend that his work is an abridgement. He offers it as a new work, drawn from original authorities; whereas he is indebted for all his most valuable English references to the labours of Mr. Horne and of other writers on sacred literature. Where *they* have honourably quoted, *he* has taken their quotations and their references without scruple, but he has most commonly garbled them with an &c. to conceal the amount of his obligations. Mr. Horne tells us (in his Preface), that his work has cost him the labour of more than twenty years; and great, we are persuaded, that labour must have been, and deeply shall we regret any injury that he may experience from any artful plagiarism; which, notwithstanding all the professions of its compiler, is defective as an introduction to the study of the Bible. We look in vain for information on many topics of Scripture antiquities and interpretation, which we had a right to expect: and we have no hesitation in saying, that any careful "English reader" of the Bible may, by the help of Bishop Tomline's manual, and of Fleury's Manners and Customs of the Israelites, acquire a much more accurate idea of the contents of the Sacred Volume, than they can from Mr. Carpenter's bulky volume.

ART. VII.—*Two Sermons, preached at Guildford, in the Archdeaconry of Stoke, in the County of Surrey, at the Spring and Autumn Visitations, 1825; the latter, before the Honourable and Venerable T. De Gray, M. A. Archdeacon of Surrey.* By Charles Jerram, M. A. *With an Appendix, on the subject of Baptismal Regeneration.* 8vo. pp. 68. 2s. London. Wilson. 1826.

To discover that we had been hitherto in error, to confess the fact before men, and to point out the method by which others may be undeceived, are three of the rarest, most difficult, and most useful works which a minister of religion can perform:

and each of them has been achieved with signal success by Mr. Jerram, in the unpretending pamphlet now before us. The facts of his case shall be communicated to our readers in his own perspicuous words.

“As my views on the subject of Baptismal Regeneration have undergone some change, and differ from those of many of my most respected friends, I think it right to give a short account of the circumstances which led to this change.

“About six years ago, a brother clergyman, for whom I entertain a high respect, put into my hands two manuscript sermons on baptismal regeneration, which he thought of publishing, with a request that I would freely state my opinion on the view which he had taken of the subject. As I was not quite satisfied with some of his statements, and had nothing better of my own to suggest, I determined to examine the subject *de novo*, and to form my own independent judgment of the whole. For this purpose I resolved to set aside all preconceived opinions; to forget, as far as I could, all that I had previously read; and to ascertain, if possible, what our church does really maintain upon it. It occurred to me that some confusion in my views of it might have arisen from an anxiety to reconcile the statement of our church with what appeared to me, the scripture doctrine of regeneration. I determined therefore, for the present, to think nothing of any apparent discrepancy of this nature; but to follow her through her formularies of baptism, her articles, and such other documents as might throw light on her meaning; and if, after all, I should find her in some respects at variance with the canon of truth, to ascribe the error to human infirmity, and to place the fact among the daily accumulating mass of proofs that nothing which proceeds from man is absolutely perfect. The result of this inquiry I will now frankly state. I am fully persuaded that our church does consider spiritual regeneration, in all cases, imparted to those who rightly receive the sacrament of baptism: or, in other words, that all who have the qualifications which our church supposes, and are baptised, according to her formularies, do, in truth, receive not only “the outward and visible sign” of this ordinance, but also “the inward and spiritual grace.” Following up this inquiry, in order to ascertain the opinion of the ancient fathers on this point, I am equally convinced that they identified baptism with spiritual regeneration; and pursuing the subject to the highest authority, I am also persuaded that this is the doctrine of the New Testament.”—pp. 47, 48.

Mr. Jerram proceeds to quote those well-known passages in the Baptismal Services, the Catechism, and the Articles, which prove that our church considers regeneration as conferred in baptism, and not as meaning what he had formerly supposed it to mean, and what “he presumes most of his respected friends” suppose it to mean—“the change of mind in which repentance and faith originate.” From the Church he proceeds to the Fathers, and from the Fathers to the Scripture.

“Having thus ascertained, to my own satisfaction, the doctrine of our church as to spiritual regeneration, I consulted such of the primitive fathers as were within my reach, as to their views upon it; and without stating the various steps which led to the conclusion, I have the fullest conviction that they are in the strictest accordance with our church. In the earliest and purest times of our religion, baptism and regeneration were used as synonymous and convertible terms.”—p. 54.

“In pursuing this subject still further, and bringing it to the standard of scriptural authority, I observed that our church, whether right or wrong, does, in point of fact, ground her doctrine of baptismal regeneration on the word of God; for in the commencement of her formulary for baptism, she states that ‘our Saviour Christ saith, none can enter into the kingdom of God, except he be regenerate and born anew of water and of the Holy Ghost,’ alluding to the conversation which our Lord had with Nicodemus, as recorded in the third of St. John’s gospel, and which she evidently considers as relating to the Christian ordinance of baptism. I found also that the fathers of the primitive church founded the same doctrine on the same passage of scripture, for Justyn Martyr, in giving an account of the universal practice of the church respecting baptism, says, that all baptized persons are ‘regenerated in the same manner as we ourselves were regenerated,’ by being ‘washed in the name of the Father, the Son, and Holy Spirit;’ ‘for,’ he adds, ‘Christ himself has said, “unless ye be regenerated, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven:”’ and that he here refers to our Lord’s conversation with Nicodemus, there can be no doubt; because he immediately alludes to the impossibility of entering a second time into the mother’s womb, and being born. Now I satisfied myself as to the authority which our church and the primitive fathers had for grounding baptismal regeneration on this discourse of our Lord by the following considerations:—I found that the subject of regeneration by baptism was not a *new* doctrine in the time of our Lord. It had a much earlier date than that of the Christian dispensation, and was coeval with the ceremony of the Jews when they received among them a proselyte from the Gentiles.”—pp. 55, 56.

“This historical fact illustrates the conversation which our Lord had with Nicodemus. This teacher of the Jews, who was convinced of our Lord’s Messiahship, came to him by night, to obtain further information respecting his new dispensation. He was immediately told that no man could enter into his kingdom unless he were ‘born again.’ This declaration surprised Nicodemus, for though he must have well known that this figurative language was applied to Jewish proselytes, he had no conception that a Jew on acknowledging the Messiah, who was to descend from their father Abraham, stood in the same relation to this dispensation as a Gentile did to Judaism; and therefore, seeing no propriety in the figurative allusion, as applicable to himself, he took the words in their natural sense, and asked the strange question, ‘How can a man be born, when he is old? Can he enter the second time into his mother’s womb, and be born?’ Upon this, our Lord renewed his assertion, with the additional information, that beside the baptism with

water, which had been hitherto customary, there must be a baptism of the Holy Spirit; and 'except a man be born of water and of the spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven.' In this respect there was no difference between Jew or Gentile. Both must pass through the same ordeal; both must be born, like the Jewish proselyte, 'of water;' and more than this, no one could be a partaker of the ultimate blessings of this spiritual kingdom, who was not also 'born of the spirit.' At this declaration, Nicodemus again expresses his surprise. Every thing was contrary to his previous expectation, and he asks 'how can these things be?' Our Lord, then, in the language of reproof, says, 'Art thou a master of Israel, and knowest not these things?' and then argues the improbability of his understanding 'heavenly things,' if he had so little knowledge of facts of the most ordinary occurrence."—pp. 57, 58.

His only remaining doubt was whether the Church and the Fathers "had used the term *regeneration* in the same sense as it is found in the New Testament:" and having observed that the sense of the word, when applied to this life, must always be metaphorical, he perceives that in Matthew, xix. 28, it must either "signify a transition from one state of things to another," or refer to a future state of existence, while

"In the remaining passage (Titus, iii. 5.) the metaphorical is obviously the only true meaning. It runs thus: 'After that the kindness and love of God our Saviour toward man appeared, not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the *washing of regeneration*, and renewing of the Holy Ghost.' All commentators identify 'the laver of regeneration' with baptism, and therefore this is an unexceptionable scriptural sanction to our church, in denominating, as she has done, this ordinance regeneration; and that it means no more than a translation from a state of nature to that of grace, is plain, from the fact, that the change of soul and spirit, which is often represented as regeneration, is set forth in the following clause, by the expression 'the renewing of the Holy Ghost.'

"Thus it appeared to me that the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, as held by our church, is supported by the authority of our Lord, and the only two passages in the New Testament where that term occurs: in the latter of them, clearly and unequivocally; and in the former, if understood *figuratively*, by direct implication, according to the opinion of many early commentators; and if *literally*, then it has no relation at all to the subject in question."—pp. 61, 62.

This conclusive statement is not more creditable to the discernment of the writer, than the open rejection of a long-cherished error is creditable to his candour and love of truth. That he did not make the discovery sooner is no disparagement to his sagacity, nor to the correctness of his present opinions. It argues great ignorance of the power of prepossession to think that it must yield, as a matter of course, to reasons which appear unan-

swerable when they have gained an early admittance. It requires an unusual effort, an effort of which few men are capable, to bring religious tenets to a test, and reject whatsoever prove unsound. The worth of such an action cannot be easily overrated; and even if it is attended with partial failure, if the whole truth is not perceived at once, but is separated slowly, painfully, and partially from the baser matter in which it is imbedded, the agent in the process is still entitled to high commendation, and perhaps the change in his sentiments is more satisfactory to those whom he joins, and more useful to those whom he forsakes, than if a sudden rejection of old notions, and adoption of new ones, laid him open to the charge of fickleness, or to the suspicion of running eagerly from one extreme to another.

The latter accusation at least cannot be advanced against Mr. Jerram. On the contrary, we conceive that he has not yet discovered the full force of his own able reasonings, or pursued them to their legitimate conclusion. The following passages will explain our meaning.

“ From what has been advanced, I think two or three things are very clear. The first is, that *Repentance and Faith are perfectly distinct from all that takes place in baptism, and form no part of what is there transacted or conferred.* They are required, in adults, as *qualifications* for baptism; and are stipulated for infants, as duties to be *hereafter* performed, when they arrive at a suitable age. Hence that change of mind, that renewal of soul, which are implied in Repentance and Faith, are evidently no part of baptismal regeneration; they are distinct in themselves, and take place at different times. It is obvious then, that, whatever be the nature of baptismal regeneration, it ought never to be confounded with that change of heart which Repentance and Faith suppose and imply. Admitting that all infants are partakers of the former, still not one of them can be exempted from the necessity of the latter, when they become practicable; and so long as an individual in our flock continues in impenitence and unbelief, it is our duty to insist upon the necessity of “ Repentance toward God, and Faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ.” By whatever name we may designate this change of heart, whether we call it regeneration, renovation, or conversion, it must take place, or there can be no participation of the blessings of the gospel.”—p. 39.

“ I observe, therefore, lastly, that our church considers all her members as *having undergone a twofold change*; one in their *nature*, the fruit of which is Repentance and Faith; the other in their *state and condition*, by which the benefits of the Gospel are conferred, and this is by baptism: and they bear the relation to each other of *duties* and *privileges*: the former belongs to us, and the latter to God. In strictness, indeed, both these changes proceed from God. The grace or power of Repentance and Faith as really comes from him as the remission of sin and the gift of the Holy Ghost: but still there is a wide difference between the two. It is the bounden duty of every sinner to

repent and believe the Gospel, and he is again and again commanded to do so, and the performance of these is his own act ; but it is not man's province in any way to confer pardon of sin, or the privilege of adoption, or the reward of eternal life. This is God's prerogative, and is exercised without any participation with man. Now when it is observed, that it is to the change in our state and condition, to the conferring of inestimable privileges and spiritual blessings, to the introduction to a new and glorious order of things, that our church has appropriated the term *Regeneration* ; we have only to restrict our use of it, when we would speak with doctrinal precision, to this blessed change ; and we shall be at liberty to avail ourselves of all the variety of expression with which the holy Scripture and the nature of the thing furnish us, to set forth the nature and necessity of the former change ; for it may with great propriety be called a renovation of heart, a renewal of the soul in righteousness, a participation of the divine nature, a new creation, a conformity of the will and affections to the mind of God, and the only source from which a life of Christian obedience can flow."—pp. 41—43.

We apprehend that in these passages Mr. Jerram has not adhered to the admirable plan which led him to discover the true meaning of regeneration. He observes, most justly, (p. 49) that "repentance and faith" are requisites for baptism ; that in adults they are pre-requisites, and that persons baptized in infancy 'are bound to perform them both, when they come to age.' But what is meant by 'repentance and faith?' Upon what authority does Mr. Jerram state that they imply 'a change of mind,' 'a renewal of soul,' 'a change of nature, the fruit of which is repentance and faith,' 'a participation of the divine nature, a new creation, a conformity of the will and affections to the mind of God, and the only source from which a life of Christian obedience can flow?' We answer without hesitation, not upon the authority of the Church. We refer him confidently to the Baptismal Services, the Catechism, the Confirmation Service, and the Liturgy, for a different explanation of the words. The Catechism declares the requisites for baptism to be "repentance whereby we forsake sin, and faith whereby we steadfastly believe the promises of God made to us in that sacrament ;" and adds, that infants promise both of these by their sureties. The public baptism of infants gives the promise of their sureties at full length ; and it contains a pledge "to renounce the devil and all his works, and constantly believe God's holy word and commandments." In the Confirmation Service, the persons that come to be confirmed, "renew the solemn promise and vow which was made in their name at baptism, ratifying and confirming the same in their own persons, and acknowledging themselves bound to believe and do *all those*

things which their godfathers and godmothers then undertook for them."

The difference, therefore, between the statements of Mr. Jerram and the Church, is, that the latter considers "repentance and faith," as synonymous with renouncing the devil, believing God's word, and obeying his commandments; while the former explains the words as implying more than this, viz. an entire change of heart and nature, of which the fruit will be repentance and faith, and without which repentance and faith cannot exist. This difference is very important, especially when Mr. Jerram tells us, in a note to his Appendix, (p. 49.) that the Church applies the word regeneration "to the grace that confers *privileges* on Christians, and not to that which gives the power to perform *duties*." How this can be said of a Church which explicitly declares that Jesus Christ hath promised in his gospel, that he would vouchsafe to receive the child about to be baptized, "to release him of his sins, to sanctify him with the Holy Ghost, to give him the kingdom of heaven, and everlasting life," we are utterly at a loss to conceive. Can an individual be sanctified with the Holy Ghost, and yet want that grace which gives the power to perform duties? And if such grace were not given in baptism, and yet were indispensable to the salvation of every individual who arrives at years of discretion, can we believe that the church would never once have mentioned it? She mentions the baptismal vow, again and again: she reminds the sponsors of it, she teaches children to say that they are bound to do and perform all things that were promised for them; and she calls upon catechumens, to ratify and confirm the same, with their own mouth and consent, openly before the congregation. But that the grace given in baptism confers no power of doing these things, is neither stated, nor implied, nor even hinted at, from one end of the Prayer-book to the other.

Nor would an appeal to Scripture be more successful than an appeal to the Church. Mr. Jerram refers us to Acts, xx. 20, 21. "I kept back nothing that was profitable unto you, but have showed you, and have taught you publicly, and from house to house, testifying both to the Jews and to the Greeks, Repentance toward God, and Faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ." This does not prove that the repentance and faith, thus testified by St. Paul, can only be produced by a grace different from that which is conferred in baptism. Nor, indeed, has it any bearing upon the precise question which Mr. Jerram is examining. For to whom did the apostle thus testify? either to *unbelieving* Jews and Greeks, in which case the passage has no immediate reference to Christians, or to *believing* Jews and

Gentiles, in which case it refers to men who embraced Christianity after they had arrived at years of discretion, and must, consequently, have repented and believed before they were baptized. But even if he could escape from this dilemma, Mr. Jerram would not be nearer to his point. We most cordially admit the universal necessity of repentance and faith; it was testified, as he observes, by St. Paul; it was testified by St. Peter; it is testified throughout the whole Bible in characters which they that run may read. But where is it said, that such repentance must be *preceded* by a change of nature, a change of heart, a renewal of the soul in righteousness, and a participation of the divine nature? That it must be preceded by *grace*, there can be no doubt; but that grace must completely change our nature before we can feel repentance, that is to say, such sorrow for sin as produces newness of life, is a mere assumption without proof. The only passages from Scripture which have ever been adduced to establish it, are those which Mr. Jerram most justly considers as applying to regeneration in baptism, and which, consequently, he is estopped from quoting in support of another change not wrought in baptism. And if, as we flatter ourselves, the same conscientious search after truth, which has led him to discover the sentiments of the church on regeneration, should also enable him to discover her sentiments on repentance and conversion, we have only to hope that he may follow up that discovery, by perceiving that, in the latter as well as in the former instance, the church is not at variance with the Scripture.

There is one other passage to which we must request the attention of our readers.

“In the course of this investigation, many collateral subjects came under my consideration, and seem to have received new light from their relation to this important topic; especially, I have been struck with the importance which our church, in common with the New Testament, attaches to the duties of repentance and faith. She admits none of a responsible age to a participation of her spiritual privileges who have not performed these duties. And upon this point I cannot but think there has been a serious neglect among many of her ministers. It appears to me that these duties have not been inculcated in their real nature and importance, upon all descriptions of characters, with that frequency and urgency which the extremity of the case demands; and it is precisely here that two very distinct classes of Christian ministers in our church appear to be at issue. One of them much insists on the necessity of all, without exception, experiencing that change of heart which leads to a godly sorrow for sin, and an entire dependence on the atoning sacrifice of Jesus Christ for its pardon; and they deny that the sacraments are of any avail without it. The other class do indeed press these duties on the profane and profligate; but they seem to think

them unnecessary to those who have been religiously educated, and have not materially departed from the decencies of Christianity. With regard to these, they would urge the importance of improvement, and of forming progressive habits of piety; but they do not appear to think that any thing like that internal change of heart, which the former consider as essential to true repentance and faith, is requisite. It should seem that all the change that was needed took place in baptism, and that all that now remains is to cherish the grace then received; and every thing that is required of a Christian will be fully accomplished.

“Now this doctrine appears to me at equal variance with our church, which requires all, without exception, to repent and believe; and excludes those that have not done so, from the spiritual privileges of the gospel; and also, with the New Testament, which testifies both to Jews and Gentiles, to the race of man universally, the necessity of repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ.”—p. 62.

The doctrinal portion of this extract is merely a repetition of sentiments which have been already examined. But the statement respecting the mode of preaching, which Mr. Jerram condemns, is, to say the least of it, inaccurate. He tells us, that there is a class, who think it unnecessary to press certain duties upon any, except the profane and the profligate. And what are these duties? “The change of heart which leads to a godly sorrow for sin, and an entire dependence on the atoning sacrifice of Christ;” or as he expresses it lower down, “repentance and faith.” That is to say, because a class of preachers does not maintain the universal necessity of a certain change, which Mr. Jerram considers essential to repentance and faith, therefore such preachers do not maintain the universal necessity for repentance and faith!! We can only say that no such class of preachers is known to us; nor to the best of our belief, can it be pointed out by Mr. Jerram. A gentleman who has given such convincing proofs of readiness to retract an error in doctrine, must be equally ready to retract an error in fact; and when he next describes a set of men from whom he is compelled to differ, we are sure that he will be scrupulously careful to describe them as they are. The mistake into which he has been betrayed is, we doubt not, unintentional, and ought not to diminish the praise and thanks that are due to him for his candid avowal of ancient mistakes, and clear exposition of his present opinions.

ART. IX.—*The History of the Inquisition of Spain, from the time of its establishment to the reign of Ferdinand VII. composed from the Original Documents of the Archives of the Supreme Council, and from those of subordinate Tribunals of the Holy Office.* Abridged and translated from the Original Works of D. Jean Antoine Llorente, formerly Secretary of the Inquisition, Chancellor of the University of Toledo, Knight of the Order of Charles III., &c. 1 vol. 8vo. 15s. London. Whitaker, 1826.

OUR *direct* knowledge of the history and transactions of the Inquisition is unusually scanty, and in most instances, carries with it but little weight of authority. Nor indeed do we readily see how this could be otherwise; for secrecy was one of the leading principles of this institution, and that which it sought to hide could be revealed by two methods only; the treachery of its agents, or the disclosures of such victims as had escaped its extreme vengeance. It is evident that no great reliance can be placed on either of these sources; the good faith of a deserter is proverbially mistrusted; and however truly an unhappy prisoner might relate his own individual sufferings, he would not have possessed more opportunities than other men of becoming acquainted with the *general* system by which they were occasioned. Moreover it was inconsistent with the keen-eyed vigilance of this tribunal, that *many* who, in either of these ways, had obtained the power of unlocking the secrets of its prison-house, should return to upper day. Hence it is, that in the professed Histories of the Inquisition, we are presented with little more than transcripts from each other; that the mode of arrest, the conduct of audiences, the horrors of the torture-chamber, and the final dismissal to penance or liberty, have been copied, with slight variation, from quarto to duodecimo, and re-copied back again from duodecimo to quarto, without sufficient vouchers for authenticity or accuracy; and although it may be too much to assert, that the whole is false, nevertheless we have little doubt that the major part is either purely imaginary, or a mixture, in which a weak tincture of Truth is largely "dashed and brewed with lies."

The earliest account of the *Spanish* Inquisition, with which we are acquainted, is contained in a small French volume, without the name of the place in which it was printed, but bearing date 1568, *Histoire de l'Inquisition d'Espagne*; and this, in many points, more especially in the disgusting description of the question, is copied nearly to the letter, by almost every succeeding writer on the subject. The work is anonymous, and does not

present any *data* upon which a judgment of the pretensions of its author to our confidence can be founded. As far, then, as this tract has been followed by others, we may be forgiven if belief in it is suspended. In 1656 an English narrative of the enormities of this tribunal was dedicated to Cromwell, then Protector, under the title of *Clamor Sanguinis Martyrum*; but this, in like manner, is devoid of authorities. Geddes, who was Chaplain of the English Factory at Lisbon, from 1678 to 1686, was a man of acute observation; he had witnessed an *auto-da-fé* in that Capital in 1682—and he recounts the pathetic exclamation of one of the condemned, who, during the short interval between the gate of his dungeon and the stake, raised his eyes with rapture to the Sun, which he had not beheld for many years, and asked how it was possible that those who saw that glorious body could worship any being but Him who created it. He was immediately gagged, and the procession (*horrendum ac tremendum spectaculum*, as Pegna, himself an Inquisitor, has fitly termed it,) moved on. The exercise of ministerial functions by a Protestant clergyman gave offence to the Portuguese Inquisition, and Geddes was summoned before it. He pleaded the existing treaty between the two Governments, and contended boldly, but ineffectually, for his privilege; and, in the end, notwithstanding the manly support which he received from the English merchants, who wrote home representing their case, and claiming a right to a Chaplain and the free exercise of their Religion, he was suspended by the Ecclesiastical Commission, through the agency of which James II. was at that time labouring to restore Popery in England. Of that which Geddes relates in his *View of the Inquisition in Portugal* (*Misc. Tracts*, I. 5.) whenever he speaks from his own knowledge, there can be no occasion to doubt; and the picture is sufficiently terrific. He had seen, with his own eyes, the insane barbarity, and heard the deafening yells of the populace when they were preparing to “make the dogs beards.” Before the piles were lighted, the miserable victims, who were chained on a seat near their summit, were exposed to the insults of the crowd which surrounded them; and, at a given signal, bundles of lighted furze, fastened on long poles, were thrust in their faces, till their chins were singed to a coal; and this prelude of torture lasted during more than half an hour, before the fagots were kindled, and they expired under a slow flame; for their height above the fire was such that it barely reached their seats.

Limborch, who comes next in order of time, had doubtless received much information from Orobio, a Spanish Jew, who, after escaping from the Inquisition, had returned to Amsterdam, and with whom this distinguished Arminian held a much more

important "friendly conference," (*collatio amica*) respecting the great truths of Christianity. But Orobio probably had little to communicate beyond that which respected himself. It was the possession of a Book of Sentences of the Inquisition of Thoulouse which gave Limborch deeper insight into the mysteries of this accursed Court. This black register contained all the Sentences passed between 1307 to 1323, and Limborch appended it to a *Historia Inquisitionis*, 1692, in which many valuable facts are ably and ingeniously deduced from writings of certain Inquisitors, of whom a catalogue is prefixed to his work. This is by far the most legitimate, and, indeed, the only safe basis on which the discoveries of such an Historian can be founded. It is scarcely necessary to state, that this work of Limborch was translated into English in 1736, by the learned and laborious Sam. Chandler, who prefaced it by a copious Introduction, from his own pen, on the rise and progress of Persecution, and the real and pretended causes of it: a paper which led him into a controversy with Dr. Berriman. Wherever Limborch relies solely upon his own acuteness and sagacity, he presents his readers with a narrative ably and substantially put together, upon framework not likely to be disjointed—but occasionally he has condescended to borrow; and whenever he does so, our confidence ceases. His work, however, on the whole, is not only the fullest, but by far the most important with which we have met on this subject.

A French work, *Memoires Historiques pour servir à l'Histoire des Inquisitions*, was produced at Cologne in 1716, in two volumes, 12mo. It contains some pretty cuts in *taille douce*, and is put together without any deficiency in the flimsiness and presumption which, for the most part, characterize *Memoires pour servir*. Mr. Baker, a clergyman, in 1736 compiled an English quarto, which pretends to little, and fulfils its pretences; and we believe that the booksellers, from time to time, have put forth sundry minor works on the Inquisition, as often as a demand seemed to present itself; in which the undigested *crambe* of former Histories has been diligently recooked, and engravings of the vault of torture, the *san benito*, the *fuego revolto*, and the skulls, marrowbones, and devils of the *relaxed*, have been carefully inserted.

The work of Paolo Sarpi relates more particularly to Venice, *Historia dell' Inquisitione e particolarmente della Veneta*—in its announcement there is no want of confidence: *Opera pia, dotta e curiosa, a consiglieri, casuisti e politici molto necessaria*; and, what perhaps will scarcely be anticipated, after such a puff direct, it does not vaunt itself beyond its merits. It contains a great mass of official *formulae*, from which a distinct view may be obtained of, at least, the outward modes of procedure, in the parti-

cular Court of which it treats. Michel Angelo Lerri, Inquisitor of Modena, has left a similar tract respecting his own tribunal. *Breve informazione del modo di trattare le cause*, 1608.

In English we have three narratives, furnished by separate individuals who have been imprisoned in the dungeons of the Inquisition. William Lithgow's account of his travels and sufferings, is very generally known; and although largely interspersed with the marvellous, it bears internal evidence of truth in many of those parts relating to the inquiry now before us. Lithgow was a pedestrian, of the school of the fantastic Tom Coryat; and he verified the adage which adjudges to pupils a superiority over their masters: for Coryat was far outwalked by him. "In his three voyages," as he himself informs us, "his painful feet have traced over, besides passages of seas and rivers, thirty-six thousand and odd miles, which draweth near to twice the circumference of the earth." But his evil stars put an end to his ambulatory powers, by throwing him into the grasp of the Inquisition at Malaga. He was arrested at first on suspicion of being a spy, in 1620; but the charge was speedily converted into one of heresy, and attempts were made to compel him to change his faith. During the progress of this regeneration, he was so cruelly subjected to torture, as to be crippled for life. A fortunate accident enabled him to make his circumstances known to the English ambassador, and he was demanded from and surrendered by his persecutors. Of the miserable state to which their barbarities had reduced him, sufficient ocular testimony was afforded to the most incredulous; for, on his arrival in England, such was still his mangled condition, that when James I. expressed a wish to see and converse with him, he was obliged to be conveyed on a feather bed to Theobald's, where he was repeatedly exhibited to a crowded Court. The king sent him twice, at his own expense, to Bath, for the benefit of the waters; but his partial restoration was but the forerunner of new misfortunes. He had been directed by James to apply to Gondomar, the Spanish ambassador, for the full value of the property which had been taken from him by the Governor of Malaga, and for an additional sum as a compensation for the injustice of his confinement. Gondomar promised fairly, but protracted the fulfilment of his promise; and Lithgow, in a moment of irritation, bitterly upbraided him in the Presence Chamber. The pride of the Spaniard could not brook this public insult, and the parties drew, and fought upon the privileged spot. The rank of Gondomar secured him from punishment for this high offence; but the less protected Lithgow atoned for it by nine months fresh imprisonment in the Marshalsea.

Isaac Martin passed two thirds of a year in the prisons of the Inquisition at Granada, in 1718. He also was released by the interposition of the English ambassador, but not until he had received 200 lashes. His story may be found in a small volume published by himself at the time, and it is repeated by Baker. The latest prisoner who has recounted his sufferings in English is John Coustos, a lapidary, and a native of Berne. He was arrested on a charge of Freemasonry, which he did not attempt to deny, by the Inquisition at Lisbon; and, after numerous unavailing attempts to seduce him from his profession of Protestantism, he was condemned to the galleys: an application from George II. procured his discharge after a short service; and he found an asylum in England, where he published his adventures in 1746. From the tone of the Preface which introduces them, it was plainly the intention of the existing Ministry, under whose auspices they were edited, to address them to a political object: since an exposure of the frauds and cruelties practised by the great public organ of the Roman Catholic Church, might be thought well calculated to strengthen the national abhorrence from that Religion, for the revival of which, under the expelled dynasty, the flames of Civil war had so recently been kindled. Notwithstanding this party purpose, we see no reason for discrediting the narrative of Coustos, and still less that of Martin; and *as far as they go*, *i. e.* as affecting the individual cases, they both afford damning evidence of the iniquity of this institution.

But by those who will take the trouble of weaving their own texture from the raw material, and of creating for themselves that most powerful and incontrovertible of all convictions, which is furnished by deductions fairly drawn from the statements of the very parties concerning whom they seek information—deductions which these parties, when they made these statements, never imagined, and still less intended, should be drawn,—a plentiful harvest may be found in the works of the Inquisitors themselves. Nicolas Eymeric, a Dominican, was created Inquisitor General of the Kingdom of Arragon in the year 1356. He was afterwards named Chaplain to Gregory XI. at Avignon, and Judge of Heretical Causes, and he died a Cardinal, having filled these high and confidential offices during four and forty years. No one, therefore, can be supposed more competent to tell all which the Holy Office permitted or desired to be told; and, accordingly, the patient investigator of truth will meet with a rich treasure in his *Directorium Inquisitorum*. This work was first printed at Barcelona in 1503; afterwards twice at Rome in 1578 and 1587, and at Venice in 1596, each time with the commentaries of Pegna, of whom we shall have occasion to speak presently. It

is divided into three parts. The first treats of the Articles of Faith: the second of the punishments assigned to heretics by the Canon law and the Decretals; of heresy itself and its different kinds; and of the crimes which fall under the jurisdiction of the Inquisition: the third of the various processes of this tribunal; of the power and privileges of its officers; of witnesses, criminals, judgments, and executions. It is not possible within our present limits to do more than offer this slight abstract of the principal heads of this important work. Its value, however, may be estimated by a recollection that it is the fruit of the experience, during almost half a century, of one who was the prime mover of the great engine, the machinery of which he partially describes.

The tract of Johannes Calderinus (he must not be confounded with his namesake, Domitius, who was an admirable classical scholar, and flourished near a century before,) *de Hereticis*, appeared in 1571. Like that of Eymeric, it is a copious Directory, but we know too little of its author (alas! for fame! he is stated at the head of his first chapter to be *inter primarios sue ætatis celeberrimus*,) to determine his competence to the task. Pegna, a Spaniard, whom we have before mentioned, in 1588 was Auditor, and subsequently Dean of the Roman Rota. Besides commenting upon the work of Eymeric, he edited the *Lucerna Inquisitorum* of Franciscus Bernardus Comensis, and himself wrote an *Instructio seu Praxis Inquisitorum*; titles which sufficiently declare the nature and contents of the works to which they belong. To these may be added the names of three other volumes; one by Francesco Bruno, *De Indiciis et Torturâ*—Lyons, 1547; another by Paramo, *De Origine et Progressu Officii Sanctæ Inquisitionis, ejusque dignitate et UTILITATE*: Madrid, 1598; and the last by Carena, who writes himself *Advocatus Fiscalis Off. Inq.*, and who published at Cremona, in 1642, *De Off. Inq. et Modo procedendi in causis Fidei*.

Of Archibald Bower we have purposely forbore to speak. We believe him to have been a cunning and needy Scotchman, who would have said and done anything for money, and who therefore can have little claims upon our credence. That he was educated at the College of Douay, was admitted into the order of Jesus, publicly taught Humanities (as his learned countrymen express themselves) and Philosophy under its direction, and in the end became Counsellor of the Inquisition at Macerata, we see no reason to deny. After this hopeful training, at forty years of age, in 1726, he abandoned his offices, escaped from Italy, and turned a hackney Protestant scribbler in England. He himself stated that this exchange arose from disgust at the enormities which he had witnessed in the Holy Office. Others boldly

asserted, that it was in consequence of the discovery of an intrigue with a Nun to whom he was Confessor; and there appears nothing in his general character, or subsequent conduct, which justifies us in pronouncing this accusation to be untrue. His *Faithful Account of his Motives for leaving the office of Secretary to the Court of Inquisition*, was printed in 1750. Little credit was attached to it at the time, and his reputation, which was at a very low standard among his contemporaries, has not been elevated above it by the judgment of posterity.

A predecessor in the same line with Bower, and as much his superior in honesty as he was below him in abilities, (for the Scotch Ex-Jesuit possessed a considerable coating of knowledge, and a truly national dexterity in displaying and applying it,) was Hieronimo Barthelemi Piazza. He had been a Dominican, a Reader of Philosophy and Divinity, and one of the Delegated Judges of the Roman Inquisition. Having taken refuge in England, he published in 1722 *A Short and True Account of the Inquisition and its Proceedings, as it is practised in Italy, set forth in some particular Cases, by H. B. P. &c.; and now by the grace of God a convert to the Church of England*. Piazza married and settled in Cambridge, where he obtained a livelihood by teaching French and Italian, more, as is recorded, to his own profit than that of his pupils. But his integrity was never impeached, and his book contains some curious particulars, which we have no doubt are authentic. That his former trade, even after his retirement, had left some of its hardness about his heart, may reasonably be supposed; and it is probably on this account that he relates the following piteous anecdote, which fell under his own immediate cognizance, with much unction and evident glee, as if he thought it a capital good story. A hue and cry was raised by the Inquisition after an offender who was *wanted*, and a particular description of his person was diligently circulated. He must have been sufficiently ill-favoured, for the unhappy Sosia who was arrested by mistake in his stead, is described as "a country curate of poor look and weakly condition, pale, lean, and of grave countenance." Terrified by his accusation, although conscious of his innocence, this miserable prisoner, when brought up to be examined a second time by Piazza, "would answer nothing but, always trembling, *Quod dixi, dixi; quod scripsi, scripsi*." "This comical story" of "the speechless and whimsical curate," was immediately communicated to head-quarters; and the close of it is detailed as follows:—

"So the poor country curate, *his hands being tied behind his back*, was carried on horseback with great solemnity, as is usual upon such occasions, surrounded by all the *Signori Patentati* and their servants, in a

cavalcade, I being at the head of 'em, from Osimo to Ancona, where the General Inquisitor resided. Here he exerted all his *cunning*, industry, and CRUELTY to make the poor curate speak, but to no purpose, TILL AT LAST HE WAS FOUND TO HAVE TURNED MAD, AND AT THE SAME TIME WAS DISCOVERED TO BE INNOCENT; for we heard from other Inquisitors that the person that was indeed guilty, had been lately arrested and taken up in some other place. This was the end of the pitiful case of this poor country curate, who was finally set at liberty and declared innocent by the General Inquisitor; but what became of him afterwards God knows, for I never heard any news of him after this *unlucky accident*."

This sad history does not require any comment. A respectable and unoffending Ecclesiastic is dragged as a public spectacle, exposed to the scorn of the rabble, before a tribunal, the well known horrors of which deprive him of his senses. Torture is used (for so much we think may fairly be understood by "cruelty") to procure his self-condemnation; and when his innocence is incontestably established, he is turned loose and unprotected on the world, without any compensation for his sufferings, or any guardianship over his insanity, too happy to have escaped with liberty, or perhaps with life, from the probable consequences of this "unlucky accident." It was Bower's falsification of this story which mainly led to the detection of his imposition. He laid the scene at Macerata, in the archives of the Inquisitorial Court of which place he pretended to have read the particulars.

A single other name will bring to an end our references to the writers on the Inquisition with whom we chance to be acquainted: a list which we feel that we have already extended beyond its due limits. Of the personal history of Reginaldus, or Gonsalvius Montanus, very little can now be learned, except that he was a Spaniard and a Protestant. He is supposed by Limborch to have collected a reformed congregation at Seville, about the time of the decease of Charles V.; and it is evident from his writings that he afterwards was a Professor at Heidelberg, where he published, in 1567, *Sanctæ Inquisitionis Hispanicæ Artes aliquot delectæ ac palam traductæ*. Most of the cases with which he illustrates the enormities of this tribunal, are repeated by some student who had heard them from his mouth, and who printed them at Heidelberg, about forty years after the appearance of this work, under the form of *De Inquisitione Hisp. oratiunculæ vii. ex narrationibus* R. C. M.; and from one or the other of these sources they have been unsparingly borrowed by later compilers. Señor Llorente says, but without citing authority, (and we have not met with any confirmation of the statement,) that Gonsalvius had escaped from the prisons of the Inquisition at Seville. As we have not any guide to assure us of their authenticity, we abstain

from citing any details; but we shall present our readers with the good round vituperation, in two learned languages, with which he assails the Institution, the wickedness of which he undertakes to expose by facts:—

“Est igitur Inquisitio horribilis, execrabilis et, post Ecclesiæ nomen cognitum, inaudita etiam apud efferatissimas gentes, et, ut uno verbo dicam, planè Diabolica, tam animi quam corporis, carnificina: quam contrà fas et jus divinum ac humanum, Romani Pontificis mancipia, permissu Regum et jussu Antichristi, exercent in fideles; ed inmanitate quâ major animo concipi nequeat, nedum oratione exponi; tantùm in hunc finem, ut Idololatria Hetrusca stabiliatur, et superstitio Romana ad posteritatem propagetur, cum certo Fidei Christianæ interitu.”

To the end of the volume are appended certain epigrams, from which we shall venture to select one, which may enable our readers to determine the reason which induces us not to transcribe more.

In Triumviros Inquisitionis.

Τισιφόνητε καὶ Ἀληκτῶ, δεινὴ τε Μέγαιρα
 Τιμωροὶ ασεβῶν, ὥς λόγος, εἰν Αἰδῇ:
 Εὐσεβέων δ' ἀνδρῶν ἐν γῇ τρεῖς εἰσὶν Ἰβηρες
 Δῆμιοι ὠμότεροι τετρακίς Εὐμενίδων.

But it is time to come to Señor Llorente, from whose confused and ill arranged histories we shall endeavour to pick out the most striking particulars. It is but just to the original author to premise, that the English work is an abridgement; but the compiler speaks of that which he has translated as “complex and voluminous,” and of his own version as being “free and condensed.” All things will bear comparison, and it is probable that, if we had the means of consulting the originals, we might assent to the latter part of this statement, respecting which, at present, we are compelled to express some doubt.

Señor Llorente styles himself Secretary to the Inquisition of Madrid during the years 1789, 1790 and 1791, and therefore he has “the firmest confidence of being able to give to the world a true code of the secret laws by which the interior of the Inquisition was governed, and to compile this History.”

“No one could write a complete and authentic History of the Inquisition, who was not either an Inquisitor or a Secretary of the Holy Office. Persons holding only these situations could be permitted to make memoranda of Papal Bulls, the ordinances of Sovereigns, the decisions of the Council of the ‘*Suprême*,’ of the originals of the preliminary processes for suspicion of heresy, or extracts of those which had been deposited in the archives. *Being myself the Secretary of the Inquisition of Madrid*, during the years 1789, 1790 and 1791, I have the firmest confidence in my being able to give to the world a true code of the secret laws by which the interior of the Inquisition was governed, of those laws which were veiled by mystery from

all mankind, excepting those men to whom the knowledge of their political import was exclusively reserved. A firm conviction, from knowing the deep objects of this tribunal, that it was vicious in principle, in its constitution, and in its laws, notwithstanding all that has been said in its support, induced me to avail myself of the advantage my situation afforded me, and to collect every document I could procure relative to its history. My perseverance has been crowned with success far beyond my hopes, for in addition to an abundance of materials, obtained with labour and expense, consisting of unpublished manuscripts and papers, mentioned in the inventories of deceased Inquisitors, and other officers of the institution, in 1809, 1810 and 1811, when the Inquisition of Spain was suppressed, *all the archives were placed at my disposal*; and from 1809 to 1812 I collected everything that appeared to me to be of consequence in the registers of the Council of the Inquisition, and in the provincial tribunals, for the purpose of compiling this History."—*Preface*, pp. 12, 13.

There is much about this account which gives us but an evil impression of its author. During the three years that he was Secretary he was deeply convinced of the iniquity of the office in which he was engaged, and yet he continued in it, for no other purpose, as it would seem, than to collect materials for his History; a History which he would never have ventured to publish but for the events which led to the overthrow of the Inquisition; an event it is scarcely possible that he could have enough foresight and sagacity to prognosticate six and thirty years ago. Of his personal history nothing further is communicated save the following singular paragraph, which places the author on a level with that which Tucca and Varis were intended to be, and the Sultan Omar really was.

"When Joseph was acknowledged King of Spain, the archives of the Supreme Council and of the Court of Inquisition were confided to me, in consequence of an order from his Majesty. With his approbation, I burnt all the criminal processes, except those which belonged to History, from their importance, and the rank of the accused; but I preserved all the registers of the resolutions of the Council, the Royal Ordinances, the Papal Bulls and Briefs, the papers of the affairs of the tribunal, and all the informations taken concerning the genealogies of the persons employed in the Holy Office, on account of their utility in proving relationship in trials when it is necessary."—p. 566.

The Preface, moreover, concludes with a statement of a cruelty so atrocious as not a little to stagger our confidence in the judgment, if not in the veracity of this writer. It requires a large proportion of credulity to admit that such a punishment as is described below could be adjudged, only six years back, in a civilized European Capital; and that by a tribunal which it is admitted (p. 61.) has long ceased to inflict torture on its prisoners.

“ The following fact shows that the inquisitors of our own days do not fall below the standard of those who followed the fanatic Torquemada. * * * * was present when the Inquisition was thrown open, in 1820, by the orders of the Cortes of Madrid. Twenty-one prisoners were found in it, not one of whom knew the name of the city in which he was: some had been confined three years, some a longer period, and not one knew perfectly the nature of the crime of which he was accused.

“ One of these prisoners had been condemned, and was to have suffered on the following day. His punishment was to be death by the *Pendulum*. The method of thus destroying the victim is as follows:—the condemned is fastened in a groove, upon a table, on his back; suspended above him is a Pendulum, the edge of which is sharp, and it is so constructed as to become longer with every movement. The wretch sees this implement of destruction swinging to and fro above him, and every moment the keen edge approaching nearer and nearer: at length it cuts the skin of his nose, and gradually cuts on, until life is extinct. It may be doubted if the holy office in its mercy ever invented a more humane and rapid method of exterminating heresy, or ensuring confiscation. This, let it be remembered, was a punishment of the Secret Tribunal, A. D. 1820 !!!—*Preface*, p. xix.

Having thus vented our misgivings, we have put it in the power of our readers to decide for themselves as to the degree of trust which they may choose to repose in Señor Llorente. On his opening chapter there is little occasion to pause; it is a very meagre abstract of Church History during the first twelve centuries. To the thirteenth century, in common with other writers, he attributes the establishment of a General Inquisition; planned by Innocent III. against the Albigenses, furthered under his auspices by St. Dominic, and finally established by Gregory IX., who was elected to the Papedom in 1227. The Arragonese branch can be traced by authentic records as far back as the year 1232, and, in the course of this century, Courts were established in the Dioceses of Tarragona, Barcelona, Urgel, Lerida and Girona. Castile adopted it in the fifteenth century. The crimes over which the old Inquisition professed to exercise jurisdiction, were heresy and suspicion of heresy, sorcery, the invocation of dæmons, schism, concealment or assistance of heretics, and refusal by a noble to take an oath that he would expel heretics from any possessions over which he had power. Bishops were the ordinary Inquisitors, by divine right; but the delegates appointed by the Pope were independent of them; and although the Inquisition had a particular prison for the accused, yet Bishops, if called upon, were obliged to lend their houses for the abode of prisoners. No reader of any English history, unless it be Dr. Lingard's, is likely to have forgotten the tender mercies of Butcher Bonner's Coal Hole.

On the accession of Ferdinand and Isabella, and the consequent union of the Kingdoms of Arragon and Castile, the Inquisition was permanently established in both, under much more severe regulations, and in that which may be considered its *modern* form. Its efforts at first were principally directed against the Jews; many of them, though outwardly converted through fear, and called *New Christians*, or *Marranos*, (the cursed race,) secretly returned to the Religion of their fathers. Confiscation was a grand object with the avaricious Ferdinand, and the Inquisition afforded him a ready instrument for wringing their treasure from the golden Hebrews. The unbaptized were forbidden from exercising the profession of physician, surgeon, barber, merchant and innkeeper, they were compelled to wear a distinguishing badge, and to inhabit separate quarters, to which they were to retire before night.

“ A convert was considered as relapsed into heresy, if he kept the sabbath out of respect to the law which he had abandoned; this was sufficiently proved if he wore better linen and garments on that day than those which he commonly used, or had not a fire in the house from the preceding evening; if he took the suet and fat from the animals which were intended for his food, and washed the blood from it; if he examined the blade of the knife before he killed the animals, and covered the blood with earth; if he blessed the table after the manner of the Jews; if he has drunk of the wine named *caser*, (a word derived from *caxer*, which means *lawful*,) and which is prepared by Jews; if he pronounces the *bahara* or benediction when he takes the vessel of wine into his hands, and pronounces certain words before he gives it to another person; if he eats of an animal killed by Jews; if he has recited the Psalms of David without repeating the *Gloria Patri* at the end; if he gives his son a Hebrew name chosen among those used by the Jews; if he plunges him seven days after his birth into a basin containing water, gold, silver, seed-pearl, wheat, barley, and other substances, pronouncing at the same time certain words, according to the custom of the Jews; if he draws the horoscope of his children at their birth; if he performs the *ruaya*, a ceremony which consists in inviting his relations and friends to a repast the day before he undertakes a journey; if he turned his face to the wall at the time of his death, or has been placed in that posture before he expired; if he has washed, or caused to be washed, in hot water the body of a dead person, and interred him in a new shroud, with hose, shirt, and a mantle, and placed a piece of money in his mouth; if he has uttered a discourse in praise of the dead, or recited melancholy verses; if he has emptied the pitchers and other vessels of water in the house of the dead person, or in those of his neighbours, according to the custom of the Jews; if he sits behind the door of the deceased as a sign of grief, or eats fish and olives instead of meat, to honour his memory; if he remains in his house one year after the death of any one, to prove his grief.” . . . “ On the 6th of January, 1481, six persons were burnt,

seventeen on the 26th of March following, and a still greater number a month after; on the 4th of November, the same year, two hundred and ninety-eight *New Christians* had suffered the punishment of burning, and seventy-nine were condemned to the horrors of perpetual imprisonment, in the town of Seville alone. In other parts of the province and in the diocese of Cadiz, two thousand of these unfortunate creatures were burnt; according to Mariana, a still greater number were burnt in effigy, and one thousand seven hundred suffered different canonical punishments."—pp. 35, 36, 37.

It was in 1483 that Father Thomas de Torquemada, a Dominican and prior of the monastery of the Holy Cross at Segovia, was appointed the first Grand Inquisitor General of Spain. His name was most appropriate to his office, (perhaps it sounds still more so in Latin, *de Turrecrematâ*,) and it must be admitted that the Inquisition has frequently been lucky in the same way: thus we meet with Philip de Barbaris, as Inquisitor of Sicily; Gaspard Juglar, of Saragossa; Philip de Clemente, as Prothonotary of Arragon; Ximenez de Cinazas, as a Commissioner, and Cardinal de Judice, as Grand Inquisitor. Torquemada drew up the first *instructions* of the Spanish tribunal; they consisted of twenty-eight articles, and their general spirit may be deduced from the fifteenth.

"If a semi-proof existed against a person who denied his crime, he was to be put to the torture; if he confessed his crime during the torture, and afterwards confirmed his confession, he was punished as convicted; if he retracted he was tortured again, or condemned to an extraordinary punishment."—p. 41.

A few of Señor Llorente's observations on the mode of procedure by which examinations were regulated, will show how little chance there was that a prisoner should escape if he once fell within the toils of the Holy Office. Thus neither the accused nor the witnesses were ever informed of the cause of their citation; they often, therefore, stated circumstances entirely foreign to the subject of inquiry. On these they were interrogated as if they formed the main accusation; so that accidental depositions served as fresh denunciations, and, upon these, new processes were commenced. All tribunals, in connection with that before which a prisoner was cited, were required to furnish against him any accusation which might chance to exist on their registers; and if one and the same charge was represented by different Courts in different terms, (as it scarcely ever could happen otherwise,) each separate representation was adduced as a distinct charge. The same practice was adopted with witnesses, and if a single conversation was related in a different manner by any given number of persons, the charge formed upon this testimony appeared to indi-

cate that the accused had expressed himself heretically on as many different occasions as there were witnesses against him. Hence the prisoner often imagined that he was accused of a great number of crimes, and if he answered one article in a different manner from another, (not perceiving that the facts were identical,) he was deemed guilty of contradiction and falsehood in his replies. Even if he confessed all that the witnesses deposed, he might still be subjected to the question; and although Señor Llorente has wisely abstained from disgusting his readers by particular representation of the severity of torture, he nevertheless affirms, that none of the accounts already given by others can be taxed with exaggeration. If the prisoner selected a lawyer for his defence, this advocate was neither allowed to see the original process, nor to communicate with his client. The sentence, be it what it might, was never communicated to the condemned till the commencement of execution: when those destined to the stake were given over to the secular arm, and *relaxed*, and those who were to be *reconciled* by different penances were attired in the *san benito*, with a paper mitre on their heads, a cord round their necks, and a wax taper in their hands. The *san benito* was a corruption of *sacco bendito*, (the blessed vest of penitence,) it was a close tunic, like a Priest's cassock, with crosses of a different colour on the breast, and in Spanish was properly named *zamarra*. St. Dominic and the original Inquisitors kindly gave it as a protecting badge to reconciled heretics, at a time when all who were suspected of heresy were indiscriminately massacred, even if unarmed, by the fury of the Papists.

A decree of the Cortes in 1518 abolished the punishment of perpetual imprisonment as inflicted by the Inquisition, and this for a reason of some considerable weight, "because the prisoners die of hunger and cannot serve God;" but the code which contained the regulations was never ratified, and Cardinal Adrian, the tutor of Charles V., and the successful rival of our own Wolsey for the Papacy, increased the severity of the existing laws. Philip II., forty years afterwards, issued that fearful ordinance, by which death and confiscation became the portion of any one who dared to sell, buy, keep or read books prohibited by the Holy Office; and the *Indices expurgatoriæ* were framed on such vague principles, that we find that of the Inquisitor General, Don Gaspard de Quiroga, in 1582, prohibiting the Index of Valdes his predecessor in the same ministry; while that of Valdes himself forbids all Hebrew books, and such in other languages as treat of Jewish customs, together with all sermons, writings, letters and discourses whatever on the Christian Religion, its mysteries, sacraments, and the Holy Scriptures, provided they were in manuscript.

Sorcery appears to have attracted great attention from the Inquisition, and Señor Lorente has presented us with the adventures of a celebrated magician, Doctor Eugene Torralva, a physician of Cuenca, whom Cervantes has immortalized in the adventure of the *Dolorida*. “*No hagas tal,*” says Don Quixote to Sancho, while both were bestriding Clavileño, *ny acuérdate del verdadero cuento del Licenciado Torralva, á quien llevaron los Diablos en volandas por el ayre caballero en una caña, cerrados los ojos, y en doce horas llegó á Roma, y se apeó en Torre de Nona, que es una calle de la ciudad y vió todo el fracaso, asalto, y muerte de Borbon, y por la mañana yá estaban de vuelta en Madrid, donde dió cuenta de todo lo que havia visto: el qual asimismo dexo, que quando iba por el ayre, le mandó el Diablo que abriese los ojos, y los abrió, y se vió tan cerca, á su parecer, del cuerpo de la luna, que la pudiera asin con la mano y que no osó mirar la tierra por no desvanecerse.*” ii. 94.

Torralva, when examined by the Inquisition, stated, that in the beginning of the sixteenth century, he formed, at Rome, an intimate acquaintance with a Dominican, named Brother Peter.

“This man told him one day, that he had in his service one of the good angels, whose name was *Zequiel*, so powerful in the knowledge of the future, that no other could equal him; but that he abhorred the practice of obliging men to make a compact with him; that he was always free, and only served the person who placed confidence in him through friendship, and that he allowed him to reveal the secrets he communicated, but that any constraint employed to force him to answer questions made him for ever abandon the society of the man to whom he had attached himself. Brother Peter asked him if he would not like to have *Zequiel* for his friend, adding that he could obtain that favour on account of the friendship which subsisted between them; Torralva expressed the greatest desire to become acquainted with the Spirit of Brother Peter.”

“*Zequiel* soon appeared in the shape of a young man, fair, with flaxen hair, dressed in flesh colour, with a black surtout; he said to Torralva, *I will belong to thee as long as thou livest, and will follow thee wherever thou goest.* After this promise *Zequiel* appeared to Torralva at the different quarters of the moon, and whenever he wished to go from one place to another, sometimes in the figure of a traveller, sometimes like a hermit. *Zequiel* never spoke against the Christian religion, or advised him to commit any bad action; on the contrary, he reproached him when he committed a fault, and attended the church service with him; he always spoke in Latin or Italian, although he was with Torralva in Spain, France, and Turkey; he continued to visit him during his imprisonment but seldom, and did not reveal any secrets to him, and Torralva desired the spirit to leave him, because he caused agitation and prevented him from sleeping, but this did not prevent him from returning and relating things which wearied him.”—p. 134.

Torralva received fees for some cures which he had performed

through herbs, the secret virtues of which had been revealed to him by his Familiar, and Zequiél on this account reproached him for his avarice. Occasionally, however, when the physician, thus debarred from legitimate practice, became sad from want of money, he found six ducats at a time lying in his chamber; but Zequiél, when questioned, would not acknowledge that he had supplied them.

“The Cardinal de Santa Cruz, in 1516, commissioned Torralba to pass a night with his physician, Doctor Morales, in the house of a Spanish Lady named *Rosales*, to ascertain if what this woman related of a phantom, which she saw every night in the form of a murdered man, was to be believed; Doctor Morales had remained a whole night in the house, and had not seen any thing, when the Spanish lady announced the presence of the ghost, and the Cardinal hoped to discover something by means of Torralba. At the hour of one, the woman uttered her cry of alarm; Morales saw nothing, but Torralba perceived the figure, which was that of a dead man, behind him appeared another phantom with the features of a woman. Torralba said to him with a loud voice, *What dost thou seek here?* The phantom replied, *a treasure*, and disappeared. Zequiél, on being questioned, replied, that under the house there was the body of a man who had been assassinated with a poignard.”—p. 136.

The voyage to Rome is related much in the same manner by Señor Llorente, as by Cervantes, save that the *sea* is substituted for the *moon*, much to the detriment of the sublimity of the narrative. The rumours which this marvellous journey occasioned, led to Torralva's denunciation. He confessed all that has been related concerning Zequiél, but wisely confined to his bosom certain doubts which he had elsewhere expressed respecting the immortality of the Soul and the divinity of our Saviour; nevertheless the Council decreed that he should be tortured, “as much as his age and rank permitted.” The points sought to be discovered were these; why he communicated with Zequiél? Whether he believed him to be a bad angel? Whether he had made a compact with him? if so, what was its nature? and whether he had invoked him at first, or afterwards, by any conjuration? The rack induced him to admit that he *now* believed the Spirit to be a bad angel, because he had brought him into misfortune; but he continued to deny the existence of any compact. The trial was suspended for one year, and

“On the 6th of March, 1531, Torralba was condemned to the usual abjuration of all heresies, and to suffer the punishment of imprisonment and the *san-benito* during the pleasure of the inquisitor-general; to hold no further communion with the spirit *Zequiél*, and never to attend to any of his propositions; these conditions were imposed on him for the safety of his conscience and the good of his soul.”—p. 140.

The Admiral of Castile, however, soon procured a remission

of Torralva's punishment, and retained him as his physician. His adventures have been introduced into different parts of the *Carlos Famoso*, a poem written by Louis Zapate, in 1566.

Another remarkable prisoner, during the seventeenth century, was Juan Perez de Saavedra, a native of Cordova. His father was a military officer, and Saavedra, who early exhibited marks of considerable ability, employed it like Chatterton, to perfect himself in the art of forgery. His first experiments were harmless, but they soon assumed a less ambiguous character, and by counterfeit Papal Bulls, Royal ordinances, Letters of change, and various signatures, he passed himself for a Knight Commander of the military order of St. Jago, and received the salary, amounting to three thousand ducats, for a year and a half. Other similar means produced him the large sum of 360,000 ducats, and his ingenious villany might have descended undiscovered to the grave, if ambition had not prompted him to a flight, scarcely paralleled in daring and extravagance. He forged a Bull from Pope Paul III., and letters bearing the signatures of Charles V. and Prince Philip, his son, to John III. King of Portugal, earnestly requesting him to establish the Inquisition in his dominions. Passing to Seville he hired a large train of attendants, bought litters and plate, and announced himself as a Cardinal Legate, *a latere*, from the Apostolical See. In that city he was received with marked distinction for eighteen days, and having announced his approach to the Court of Lisbon, he was met on the frontier with all due honours, and conducted to the Capital, in which, during three months, he successfully maintained the delusion. But the mask, however skilfully worn, could not be supported for ever. We are not informed of the particular facts which led to his detection; but while he was engaged on a tour through the several Dioceses of the kingdom, he was entrapped and arrested by the Familiars of the Spanish Inquisition. He was sentenced to ten years service in the galleys, wherein, however, he passed altogether, not less than nineteen; for the Alcaldes of Madrid refused to grant his release until they were compelled to accord it by a Papal Brief, which this arch-swindler had dexterity enough to procure, by representing that he had done several things extremely useful to Religion and the State, in the exercise of his false legation. In 1562, he was presented to Philip II. and the narrative which he related to that Monarch, was written down as he delivered it by Antonio Perez. Five years afterwards, Saavedra himself composed a similar history for the Inquisitor General.

But by far the most extraordinary case which was ever supposed to have been submitted to the authority of the Inquisition, both as respects the station or the fate of the culprit, is that of the miserable Don Carlos—miserable, whether we regard him as

the victim of his own evil and depraved passions, or of the vindictive jealousy of a cruel father. Señor Llorente professes to have examined the archives of the Holy Office with the closest care; and from these he affirms that Don Carlos was neither tried nor condemned by the Inquisition, as all former narratives have asserted; that an opinion was given against him by the Council of State, of which the Inquisitor-general was President; a circumstance which may have occasioned the very general error; and that he perished in the end through a verbal sentence approved by his father. The stipulation that Don Carlos should marry Isabella of France was inserted, as a secret article, in a treaty concluded when the Prince was as yet not more than thirteen years of age; and there is reason, as Señor Llorente concludes, to suppose that he never was acquainted with this design; nor has he found in the MSS. which he has consulted any fact which may justify the belief that he was ever, in point of fact, in love with his stepmother. His disposition, even from boyhood, seems to have been marked by an insane ferocity, which led him to amuse himself, in very early years, by cutting the throats of young rabbits, and watching their expiring agonies. This instinctive perversion was increased by a severe fall, which injured the spine and head, when he was about seventeen years of age. His vices were confirmed by manhood, and he occasionally broke out into furious and indecent bursts of passion, which led to acts of extravagant and brutal violence. He often struck his servants, and on one occasion, his bootmaker having brought home a pair of boots which were too small, they were cut in pieces by the Prince's order, cooked, and forced down the unhappy cobbler's throat, to the great danger of his life. He attempted (and it would have been fortunate for humanity if he had succeeded) to stab the Duke d'Alva; and, in the end, when a marriage was proposed between him and his cousin, Anne of Austria, dissatisfied with the tardiness of the preliminary negotiation, he projected (like our own Charles I.) a secret visit to Germany, in order to accelerate the nuptials—a fact (if it be such) which would effectually disprove his accredited love for his stepmother. The persons to whom he applied for money, that he might compass this wild project, awakened in him thoughts of more ambitious tendency. They promised to declare him chief Governor of the Low Countries, and, in the end, kindled in his mind the atrocious hope of compassing his father's assassination. So incautiously, however, did he proceed, and so indiscriminately and openly did he communicate his guilty intentions, that Philip was early apprized of them. The following account of the Prince's arrest is given from the narrative of one of his ushers, written a few days after it had taken place.

"The prince, my master," says he, "had been for some days unable to take a moment's rest; he was continually repeating that he wished to kill a man whom he hated. He informed Don John of Austria of his design, but concealed the name of the person. The king went to the Escorial, and sent for Don John. The subject of their conversation is not known; but was supposed to be concerning the prince's sinister designs. Don John, doubtless, revealed all he knew. The king soon after sent post for the Doctor Velasco; he spoke to him of his plans, and the works at the Escorial, gave his orders, and added that he should not return immediately. At this time happened the day of jubilee, which the court was in the habit of gaining at Christmas; the prince went on the Saturday evening to the Convent of St. Jerome. I was in attendance about his person. His royal highness confessed at the convent, but could not obtain absolution, on account of his evil intentions. He applied to another confessor, who also refused. The prince said to him, '*Decide more quickly.*' The monk replied, '*Let your highness cause this case to be discussed by learned men.*' It was eight o'clock in the evening; the prince sent his carriage for the theologians of the convent of *Atocha*. Fourteen came, two and two; he sent us to Madrid to fetch the monks Albarado, one an Augustine, the other a Maturin; he disputed with them all, and obstinately persisted in desiring to be absolved, always repeating that he hated a man until he had killed him. All these monks declaring that it was impossible to comply with the prince's request, he then wished that they should give him an unconsecrated wafer, that the court might believe that he had fulfilled the same duties as the rest of the royal family. This proposal threw the monks into the greatest consternation. Many other delicate points were discussed in this conference, which I am not permitted to repeat. Every thing went wrong; the prior of the Convent of *Atocha* took the prince aside, and endeavoured to learn the quality of the person he wished to kill. He replied that he was a man of very high rank, and said no more. At last the prior deceived him, saying, '*My Lord, tell me what man it is; it may, perhaps, be possible to give you absolution according to the degree of satisfaction your highness wishes to take.*' The prince then declared that it was the king, his father, whom he hated, and that he would have his life. The prior then said, calmly, '*Does your highness intend to kill the king yourself, or to employ some person to do it?*' The prince persisted so firmly in his resolution, that he could not obtain absolution, and lost the jubilee. This scene lasted until two hours after midnight; all the monks retired overwhelmed with sorrow, particularly the prince's confessor. The next day I accompanied the prince on his return to the palace, and information was sent to the king of all that had passed.

"The monarch repaired to Madrid on Saturday; the next day he went to hear mass in public, accompanied by his brother and the princes. Don John, who was ill with vexation, went to visit Don Carlos on that day, who ordered the doors to be shut, and asked him what had been the subject of his conversation with the king. Don John replied that it was about the gallies. The prince asked him many questions to find out something more, and when he found that his uncle would not be more

explicit, he drew his sword. Don John retreated to the door; finding it shut, he stood on his defence, and said, '*Stop, your highness.*' Those who were outside having heard him, opened the doors, and Don John retired to his hotel. The prince, feeling, indisposed, went to bed, where he remained till six in the evening; he then rose and put on a dressing-gown. As he was still fasting at eight o'clock, he sent for a boiled capon; at half-past nine he again retired to bed. I was on duty on that day also, and I supped in the palace.

"At eleven o'clock I saw the king descending the stairs; he was accompanied by the Duke de Feria, the grand prior, the lieutenant-general of the guards, and twelve of his men: the king wore arms over his garments, and had a helmet on; he walked towards the door where I was; I was ordered to shut it, and not to open it to any person whatever. These persons were already in the prince's chamber, when he cried, '*Who is there?*' The officers went to the head of his bed, and seized his sword and dagger. The Duke de Feria took an arquebuse loaded with two balls. The prince, having uttered cries and menaces, was told, '*The Council of State is present.*' He endeavoured to seize his arms, and to make use of them; he had already jumped out of bed when the king entered. His son then said to him, '*What does your majesty want with me?*' '*You will soon know,*' replied the king. The doors and windows were fastened; the king told Don Carlos to remain quietly in that apartment until he received further orders; he then called the Duke de Feria, and said, '*I give the prince into your care, that you may guard him and take care of him:*' then addressing Louis Quijada, the Count de Lerma, and Don Rodrigo de Mendoza, he said to them, '*I commission you to serve and amuse the prince; do not do anything he commands you without first informing me. I order you all to guard him faithfully, on pain of being declared traitors.*' At these words the prince began to utter loud cries, and said, '*You had much better kill me, than keep me a prisoner; it is a great scandal to the kingdom: if you do not do it, I shall know how to kill myself.*' The king replied, '*that he must take care not to do so, because such acts were only committed by madmen.*' The prince said, '*Your majesty treats me so ill, that you will force me to come to that extremity, either from madness or desperation.*' Some other conversation passed between them, but nothing was decided on, because neither the time nor place permitted it."—pp. 390—394.

During his confinement Don Carlos manifested the greatest impatience. He refused to confess; and was so irregular in his meals and repose that a perpetual fever preyed upon him. He put ice in his bed to temper the insupportable heat and dryness of his skin. He walked about naked for whole nights, and during eleven days refused any sustenance, only drinking immoderately of iced-water, which failed to relieve his burning thirst. A malignant fever and dysentery was the consequence of this rashness. Meantime the king created a special Commission for the examination of the case. He himself presided, and his assessors were Cardinal Espinosa, the Inquisitor-general; the Prince of

Evoli; and Don Diego Bribiesca de Muñatones, a Councillor of Castile. These Commissioners condemned the unhappy Prince to death, for having attempted parricide and treason; but they added, at the same time, that general laws might be suspended in causes affecting the Blood Royal, and that, for the good of his subjects, the King might commute the punishment. Philip, however, affected the Roman Father. He opposed his conscience to his heart, (the real balance would have been nicely adjusted) and stating that it would be most unfortunate for his Kingdom if it were to be governed by a King "devoid of knowledge, talent, judgment, and virtue, full of vices and passions, and above all, furious, ferocious, and sanguinary," he resolved upon permitting the laws to take their course, (a most convenient expression whenever an act of cruelty is to be perpetrated) "notwithstanding his attachment to his son and his anguish at so terrible a sacrifice." The conclusion of the Tragedy is well known, although the precise manner by which the catastrophe was brought about has been differently represented. The King suggested that, from the state of health in which the Prince then was, there could be little *hope* of prolonging his life, and that it would be right to suffer him to commit some excess in eating and drinking which would produce his death. Before this took place, however, due care for his salvation imperiously required that he should confess and be absolved. The Prince of Evoli was commissioned so to express himself to Olivarez, the attendant physician, that he could not mistake the part which he was expected to perform. Olivarez accordingly administered a medicine which, in the expressive words of Louis Cabrera, (Hist. Philip II. vii.) a contemporary employed in the palace, "did not produce any beneficial effect, and the malady appeared mortal." Don Carlos confessed; three days after the King visited him, twice *gave him his blessing, and retired weeping*, and on the morning of the fourth the Prince expired.

There is little of interest in the remainder of this volume. The passion for *autos-da-fé*, as public amusements, continued to a late season. The new Queen, Elizabeth de Valois, daughter of Henry II. of France, was entertained with one of these celebrations on her first arrival in Spain, in 1560, when she was no more than thirteen years of age; and in 1680, when Charles II. married Maria Louisa de Bourbon, nineteen miserable wretches expired in the flames in testimony of the national joy. Soon after Diaz, the Bishop elect of Avila, the royal confessor, was accused of having consulted *dæmons*. Charles II. had been unsuccessfully exorcised by Diaz; for his failure in progeny was gravely supposed to be the result of *dæmoniacal* possession. But a rival

conjurer extorted from the foul fiend an admission that a spell had been put upon the king, because the holy sacrament was left in the church without lamps or wax candles, and the communities of monks were dying of hunger; and Diaz, in order to unbewitch his master, redoubled his incantations. This was the basis of a subsequent charge from which he escaped by flight.

In 1732 Donna Aguida, a lady of noble birth, and of great reputation for sanctity, expired under the torture. The charges against her were infanticide and compact with the devil; and of the truth of one of these, at least, very adequate proofs seem to have been adduced. Still later, in 1781, a Nun was burned for a similar diabolical connection. She was the last person who was committed to the flames by the Inquisition. In 1808 Buonaparte decreed the suppression of this tribunal: in 1813 the Cortes-General of Spain renewed the decree as on their own authority; and in the following year, one of the first measures after the return and restoration of our then faithful ally, Ferdinand, was the re-establishment of the Holy Office in its former power and privileges.

We shall add, in conclusion, Señor Llorente's calculation of the number of victims whom the Inquisition has sacrificed. From the *data* on which he professes to have formed them, they by no means demand implicit assent. The first statement, however, is furnished by the parties themselves, and, horrible as it is, its truth therefore must be admitted. In the Castle of Triana, at Seville, wherein the Inquisitorial tribunal was held, an inscription, erected in 1524, imports that between that year and 1492 about 1000 persons had been burned, and 20,000 condemned to various penances. In the four years of the Marian persecution 288 persons were burned; so that Gardiner and Bonner exceeded Torquemada in zeal by a ratio of more than two to one. During the 300 years from 1481 to 1781, 31,912 heretics are said to have perished in the flames—and, adding to this period the years up to the present time, 17,639 effigies have been burned, representing such criminals as the Inquisition could not catch for more substantial vengeance—and 291,456 have been condemned to severe penances. Such are the fruits of that Persuasion which we are required to admit into a free participation of power, and the reinstatement of which in the means of offence among ourselves, we are considered narrow-minded, bigoted, and illiberal for continuing to oppose.

ART. X.—1. *Précis du Système Hiéroglyphique des anciens Egyptiens, ou Recherches sur les élémens premiers de cette écriture sacrée, sur les diverses combinaisons, et sur les rapports de ce système avec les autres méthodes graphiques Egyptiennes.* Par M. Champollion le Jeune. Avec un volume de plâches (lithographiées). A Paris. 1824. 1 vol. large 8vo. 16. 4to. 32 plates.

2. *Lettres à M. le Duc de Blacas d'Aulps, Pair de France, &c. relatives au Musée royal Egyptien de Turin.* Par le même. Première Lettre—Monuments Historiques. A Paris. 1824. Large 8vo. pp. 109. Three Plates.

3. *Deuxième Lettre.* A Paris. 1826. Plates 4—16.

WHOEVER has experienced the pleasure felt by a traveller as he watches the dispersion of the mist which conceals the valley beneath him; and sees one almost uniform blank suddenly replaced by all the variety of hill and dale; lawn and forest; tranquil pools and rapid torrents;—will be aware of the sensation produced,—though in a very different degree,—by a perusal of the works named above. Most readers will probably feel much disappointment on first looking into them, especially such as are unprepared by an acquaintance with the able essay on hieroglyphics contained in the Supplement to the Encyclopædia Britannica. Finding much that looks like gratuitous hypothesis, vague conjecture, and unwarranted inference, they will be tempted to lay the book aside in despair, and conclude, that M. Champollion's system, though less extravagant than Kircher's, and more definite than Palin's, has no *point d'appui*, no fixed point, nothing, in short, which is so immoveable as to afford a firm basis for further speculations. On a closer examination, however, this method of interpreting the hieroglyphics will appear in a very different light, and so many unexpected coincidences will occur, so many independent evidences arise, all tending to the same point and leading to the same conclusions, that the most sceptical will be compelled to acknowledge, with the Italian proverb, "*Se non e vero, e ben trovato!*" It is indeed as much in the results of M. Champollion's researches, as in the system itself, that its probability is manifested, and for that reason the tracts named at the head of this Article, have been added to his *Précis du Système Hiéroglyphique*. The full merit of the latter could hardly be shown without some notice of the former. While the one unfolds his method of interpretation and gives the theory of

his doctrine, the other shows its practical application and the value of the knowledge obtained by it.

M. Champollion's book naturally divides itself into three parts; 1. An 'Introduction,' pointing out the object and extent of his work (i. 1—12.); 2. A developement of the observations which form the basis of his system (ch. i.—viii. pp. 12—251.); 3. The system itself, illustrated by its application to a considerable number of hieroglyphical inscriptions, which are thus, either wholly or partially, explained (ch. ix. x. pp. 251—400.) From his Introduction it will not be necessary to extract any thing more than the substance of the six Propositions by which it is terminated. Its object is, in fact, to demonstrate the inadmissibility of some unguarded expressions dropped by a writer in the *Quarterly Review*; (Oct. 1822. No. LV. pp. 188. 192, 193)—a point so manifest to all persons not blinded by precipitation and dogmatism, that M. Champollion might perhaps have spared himself some trouble without doing any injury to his cause. He also wishes to point out where he has gone beyond Dr. Young in the application and enlargement of the views which that learned and acute scholar first developed, and to show the universality of the method of representing *sounds* by *images*, first discovered from its application to the expression of names foreign to the Egyptians. The six propositions mentioned above are as follows:—

1. That the hieroglyphical alphabet was used to express royal names and titles in every age.

2. That the *phonetic* alphabet is the true key to the whole system of hieroglyphics.

3. That it was used by the Egyptians at all periods, to express words as well as names in their own language.

4. That all hieroglyphical inscriptions contain a great number of words so expressed.

5. That characters belonging to different classes were used simultaneously in such inscriptions; and

6. That from all the preceding propositions a general theory of the hieroglyphical system of writing may be deduced.

The first five of these propositions are merely an introduction to the sixth, and from these the first eight chapters of the *Précis* are derived. Being aware that analysis is more agreeable in a new and disputable doctrine than synthesis, M. Champollion has judiciously begun by giving a short view of the progress of this branch of study (chap. i. 12—38), and shows its results first (1) in the discovery of Greek and Latin proper names (chap. ii. 38—49) expressed in hieroglyphics; then (2) by deducing an alphabet from them, and ascertaining that some were strictly *ideogra-*

phic (ch. iii. 49—65), while others were invariably phonetic, he next proves (3) that the particles, terminations, and other grammatical forms of the Egyptian language, were expressed phonetically (chap. iv. 66—83); that (4) in the vernacular names some hieroglyphics were the actual images, others only the symbols of the idea expressed (chap. v. vi. 84—130); that (5) the same was the case with respect to the titles given to gods and princes (chap. vii. 131—172); and (6) that the names and titles even of the Pharaohs were expressed by the same method. (chap. viii. 172—251.) A considerable portion of this introduction is polemical, for the author is very desirous of proving that he has borrowed little, if anything, from the lucubrations of Dr. Young. By his extreme courteousness he has almost disarmed criticism, and though there is no reason to dispute his having in many cases anticipated that learned and acute writer's discoveries, it may be doubted whether he is altogether willing to do him entire justice any more than he was in another work, (*L'Egypte sous les Pharaons*, i. xxv.) to deal quite fairly with an adversary who complained of a parallel injudiciously drawn by one of his friends.* Though all this part of the work is illustrated by pertinent examples, and gives scope to a variety of interesting remarks, yet, as it is only introductory, and the most important portion of it, that which relates to the names of the Pharaohs, has been already noticed in a former article, (*British Critic*, Oct. 1825. No. I. p. 87—94) it will be most proper now to pass on to the concluding chapters, (ch. ix. 251—366. ch. x. 366—400), and give as large an abstract, as our limits will allow, of the “*Elements of the Hieroglyphic System of Writing*,” which they contain.

M. Champollion's first inquiry (§ i. 253—258) is directed to “the forms of” the “signs” by which the Egyptians expressed their ideas. Of these the most ancient and obvious were with them, as with the Chinese and Mexicans, *images* of the things signified; but *visible* objects alone could be thus represented; those which fall under the other senses, and most especially *abstract* ideas, could only be expressed by *symbols* derived from such images; hence arose the different classes into which the hieroglyphical characters, on an attentive examination, naturally fall. These classes are distinctly pointed out by M. Champollion; but he first notices the different degrees of perfection with which the hieroglyphics are executed (§ ii. 258—263); their

* See *Observations sur quelques points de la Géographie de l'Egypte*, (Paris, 1812,) by M. Etienne Quatremère, Greek Professor at Rouen, whose Coptic Lexicon, it is to be hoped, will not be longer withheld from the public.

probable numbers, as far as can yet be ascertained, (§ iii. 268—368) and the various directions in which they are placed. (§ iv. 268—272.)

With regard to style of execution, the hieroglyphics may be also subdivided into five different orders:—1. *pure* hieroglyphics, which are distinct images of the objects represented: 2. *umbratic* hieroglyphics, which are mere outlines sunk into the stone, in order to be filled with paste or enamel: 3. *profiles*, or similar outlines, drawn or scratched with a graver, and filled up with some uniform colour: 4. *linear* hieroglyphics, a reduction of those in the last class to an imperfect sketch or hint of the thing signified: 5. the *hieratic* character, or short-hand hieroglyphics; forming a mere memorandum of the implied image, and bearing the same relation to it as the present Chinese character does to the original forms of the Syang-hing, or “images” used in the earliest ages: 6. the *demotic*, or popular hand, an abbreviation even of the hieratic character, to which it bears a close resemblance, though it often happens that scarcely any vestige of the fundamental hieroglyphic can be traced. Nothing, indeed, but a minute comparison of corresponding texts in all these different styles, could convince any one of their filiation, and it was, we believe, by such a process that Dr. Young (to whom alone that discovery is due)—(*Hieroglyph. Lit.* p. 14.) ascertained the fact, that the Egyptians had no alphabetic character whatever; and that the *epistolographic* or *demotic*, as well as the *hieratic*, were merely compendious abridgments of the hieroglyphics. M. Champollion has very properly added a plate, containing the same text expressed in all these different characters, except the last: the identical symbols, however, do not always recur, equivalents, as is the case in all corresponding texts, being occasionally substituted. The three first of these orders are merely varieties of the true hieroglyphics; the fourth is considered as the *hieratic* by Dr. Young, and the fifth, which he calls *enchorial*, is that so named on the Rosetta stone, whence all certain knowledge of these characters is derived. The sixth, which is not mentioned by M. Champollion in this place, is found in deeds and other documents preserved with mummies, and approaches so near to the 5th, that it may be doubted whether they are really distinct.

The number of hieroglyphic characters absolutely differing from each other, has been variously estimated, and, as M. Champollion observes, cannot possibly be determined till most of the inscriptions in those characters have been copied. His own observations led to the following results:—

Of hieroglyphics representing

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|-----|------------------------------|-----|
| (1) Heavenly bodies, there are | 10 | (10) Insects | 14 |
| (2) Man | 120 | (11) Vegetables | 60 |
| (3) Limbs of the human body | 60 | (12) Houses, &c. | 24 |
| (4) Wild beasts | 24 | (13) Furniture, &c. | 100 |
| (5) Domestic animals | 10 | (14) Dress and accoutrements | 80 |
| (6) Limbs of beasts | 22 | (15) Tools and utensils | 150 |
| (7) Birds, and limbs of birds | 50 | (16) Cups, vessels, &c. | 30 |
| (8) Fish | 10 | (17) Géometrical figures | 20 |
| (9) Reptiles | 30 | (18) Monsters | 50 |
| | 336 | | 528 |

So that the whole amounts only to 864, which is probably much below the truth. With regard to the place of these figures, great freedom seems to have been allowed. They might be arranged either perpendicularly or horizontally, from right to left, or from left to right; but the latter is the most prevalent order; and as the figures always look towards the side where the inscription begins, they show the direction in which it must be read: care was also taken to leave no gaps, so that the smaller figures are often arranged in vertical groups, though the whole line is horizontal.

The classes under which the various kinds of hieroglyphics may be distributed are thus enumerated:—(§ v. p. 271.) 1. The *primitive* or absolute hieroglyphics, called “figurative characters” by M. Champollion. (§ vi. 73—282.) 2. The *symbolical*, or relative hieroglyphics; (§ vii. 212—304.) and 3. The *phonetic* characters. The first, as before observed, are the images of the objects expressed; the second are the figures by which abstract ideas are metaphorically implied; and the third are used for the purpose of denoting sounds.

The symbols are of various kinds, and often enigmatical;—thus, two arms holding a bow and arrow, signify “a battle;”—a censer, with some grains of incense, “an act of adoration;”—a man throwing javelins, “an insurrection;”—a hair pencil, reed, pallet and ink-horn, denote painting, writing or letters. Sometimes a part was put for the whole, or vice versâ; at others, the symbol was quite arbitrary; as the beetle used for “paternity,” and “the world;” the vulture for “maternity;” and a cieling, or a woman placed in the position of a cieling, for “the heavens.” The symbols employed to represent the names of the deities were either human figures, with the heads of animals consecrated to those gods, or the animals themselves, bearing the peculiar insignia of the god whom they represented: the ram, for Ammon Cneph; the hawk crowned with a disk, for Ré or Phré; the ibis, for Thoth; the crocodile, for Suchis, &c. Some deities are also represented by symbols, the origin of which

is not so obvious ; an eye over a throne, denotes Osiris ; a Nilo-meter, Phtha, and an obelisk, Ammon.

But, by such symbols, the connexion and relations of the different parts of a sentence could not be determined ; for that purpose a further expedient was necessary ; and the Egyptians, like the Chinese, (Remusat, *Gram. Chinoise*, p. 4,) were compelled to devise some method of representing sounds, independently of the sense attached to them. The different character of their languages, however, occasioned a corresponding difference in their expedients for that purpose. The Chinese wanted nothing but single consonants, terminated by a simple or nasal vowel : the Egyptians, on the contrary, had monosyllables and dissyllables to represent, many of them beginning or ending by double consonants ; so that while the former assumed the signs of well-known objects as the representatives of the whole monosyllables, by which those objects were named, the latter used similar signs to represent the initial sounds alone,* and had no need of the adjunct required by the Chinese to indicate the peculiar office of such characters. The hieroglyphics appropriated to this purpose have been denominated by M. Champollion, “phonetic ;” and the discovery of their being universally applied, certainly constitutes his great merit. Dr. Young had observed the coincidence of certain hieroglyphics with some of the Coptic particles, (Append. to Belzoni’s *Travels*, 491—507) and the resemblance between the corresponding enchorial characters and the letters which form those particles ; he, therefore, here, as elsewhere, laid the foundation on which the author of the *Précis* has, with so much skill, raised his superstructure. But our learned and acute countryman does not seem to have ever supposed that other significant words in the Egyptian language were expressed by these picture-letters, and for the knowledge of that fact we are indebted to the work before us.

Zoëga, one of the ablest and most learned of modern writers on the literature of ancient Egypt, has shown that the concurrent testimony of the classic authors seems to prove that the Egyptians used an alphabetical character. (*De Origine et Usu Obelisc*, 556—558.) The passages which he cites allude, no doubt, to the demotic, or enchorial character, which suggests, at first sight, the idea of letters similar to those of the Phœnicians and other Asiatic nations ; and the error into which his authorities had fallen may be compared

* If a Chinese wished to express the pronunciation of *vang*, he would write “cut vû, shang ;” *i. e.* cut off the v of vû, and the ang of shang, and put them together in order to form vang. In many compound words also, some of the component parts have been added merely to show the pronunciation, but in these cases no such indication is added : thus the characters for cypress are Pe-tree, signifying not white tree, but the tree named Pê.

with another, to which they also gave birth, viz. that images or symbols alone were expressed by the hieroglyphics. Both originated in the slight and perfunctory manner, in which questions respecting the literature of foreign nations were examined by the Greeks and Romans. (p. 320, 321.) The more closely we compare Egyptian texts, evidently containing the same subjects, expressed for the most part in the same words, the more distinctly is it manifested that the demotic or enchorial characters correspond exactly with the hieroglyphics; and, that when there is any discrepancy between them, it is not occasioned by the use of another letter, but by the equivalent of another hieroglyphic representing the same letter. For, as, according to the plan mentioned above, any common object, of which the name began by the sound required, might be taken to represent that sound; the variety of such representatives would be almost unlimited, and the texts thus expressed would be as truly a series of images as those in which the real, or symbolical representations of the things signified were employed. It was, perhaps, this license, as to the literal hieroglyphics, that occasioned the obscurity under which the Egyptian doctrines were sometimes veiled: but in ordinary cases, this change of imagery occasioned no difficulty to the reader—the name of the figures represented immediately recurred to his recollection, and whether it were a *mouth* or a *pomegranate*, it equally reminded him of the initial *r* in *ro*, and *roman*. The variety of such signs, moreover, does not seem to have been very great: five-and-twenty (the hieroglyphics representing S) is the largest number yet ascertained as belonging to the same letter; and these might be reduced without much difficulty to seventeen: so that the Egyptian character was doubtless both read and written with much more facility than the Chinese, the real difficulty of which has, moreover, been greatly over-rated.

That pictures, like those used by the Mexicans, were the prototypes of hieroglyphics, and that the addition of symbols was the next step in this method of expressing ideas, cannot be doubted; but at what time signs indicative of sounds were introduced, and the habit of abstraction had become so common as to suggest the combination of those signs for the purpose of supplying the place of oral language, it is impossible to determine. The most ancient Egyptian inscriptions, yet examined, consist of hieroglyphics of all the different orders, so that the system followed in the first ages of our era was already in common use, at least, twenty centuries before the beginning of that period. It is evident, also, that the phonetic characters belonged to an alphabetical system, similar to that of the Semitic dialects, in which all but the emphatic vowels are pronounced with great rapidity and very

indistinctly, and are, therefore, implied, but not expressed.* The use of a soft breathing, also, similar to the *alif* of the same family of languages, is another peculiarity which seems to give some colour to the hypothesis of M. Seyffarth, who maintains that the demotic is a corrupt form of the Phœnician alphabet, and that the hieroglyphics are an ornamental and mysterious mode of forming the same letters. That hypothesis, however, is not only built upon a gratuitous assumption, but is irreconcilable to many well established facts. The deficiency and uncertainty of the vowels marked in the phonetic alphabet, so far from affording any advantage to the opponents of M. Champollion's theory, are, in fact, a corroboration of its truth; for the Coptic, which is nothing more than the Egyptian language written in the Greek character—especially the Sâidic or Theban dialect of it—presents innumerable examples of the habitual suppression of medial vowels; and has an abundance of words formed of consonants alone.† The same hieroglyphics also equally mark the aspirated and unaspirated letters, and those which stand for *l* and *r* are used promiscuously; so that precisely the same sounds are indeterminate in the hieroglyphic alphabet, as are interchangeable in the Coptic; and the figured texts may be read off with equal ease in either of its three dialects, the Thebaïc, Memphitic, or Bashmuri; for *p*, *c* and *t* in the first, are replaced by the corresponding aspirates in the second; and *r* in the two first is changed into *l* by the third. The long vowels, also, are subject to much variation in these different dialects, just as the *a* in Arabic, is generally *o* or *u* in Hebrew, and *u* in Punic.‡

This abundance of different signs representing the same sound put it into the power of the Egyptians to select such as might convey a covert allusion to some peculiarity in the object expressed; and on this principle M. Champollion has ingeniously accounted for the use of some phonetic hieroglyphics in preference to others: thus *the ram* he thinks was used for *b* in Nûb, (Chnubis or Cneph) rather than a *censer* or a *leg*, because the ram was the proper symbol of the god so named: the *vase*, also, was employed to denote the *N*, because he was figured with a *vase* at his feet. The *lion*, king of beasts, is used for *L* or *R* in names of *kings*; the *ram* stands for the *B* in "Tiberius" at Esnà, because

* This implied vowel, called Fat'hah (the mere opening of the mouth) by the Hebrews and Arabs, is pronounced by the Persians and Indians like the *u* in our words, "shut, rut, cut." It corresponds exactly with the *yet* of the Armenians, which is always substituted for every suppressed vowel, and is never expressed except where indispensably necessary.

† Such as *mn* "with;" and *mnt*, "attribute;" *rm*, "inhabitant;" *snt*, "to create;" *tm*, "to shut;" *stm*, "to hear;" *ntk*, "thee," &c.

‡ Head is *Ras*, Ar.; *Rosh*, Heb.; *Rus*, Punic.

Ammon Chnubis was the god to whom that temple was dedicated; the *censer* is put for the same letter in *sebastos*—which signifies “adorable,” “august.” In Roman names and titles, A is generally expressed by the eagle, (akhôm) the known emblem of the Roman power.

That the same word was usually expressed by the same symbols is also shown by another circumstance, first noticed, we believe, by M. Champollion; viz. that certain abbreviations are of common occurrence in the hieroglyphical texts. Sometimes the first and last phonetic character, or the first alone, is placed for the whole group. This is only done in common words, of frequent occurrence;—and what could be, *a priori*, more probable than the use of such abbreviations, when we see such extraordinary ones introduced into the legal documents of the Egyptians, drawn up in Greek? (See Young on Hieroglyph. Lond. 1823. p. 149).—This strong corroboration of M. Champollion’s doctrine with respect to these abbreviations, he has either overlooked or purposely left for others to point out.

As a summary of all his preceding remarks, he closes his eighth section (ch. 9. §. 8. p. 327) by observing, that there is no system of Egyptian characters either exclusively representative, ideographic, or phonetic; but that these three methods of expressing ideas were all intimately combined and used in the hieroglyphic texts, not only at the same time, but almost in the same word.

The testimony of the Greek and Roman writers, as was before observed, convinced Zoëga that the Egyptians possessed an alphabetic character; but if the demotic and hieratic were merely degradations of the hieroglyphic character, must not that testimony be set aside? Before an answer is given to this question, it will be well to notice what may be called the cardinal authority on this subject furnished by any Greek writer.—It is a passage from the *Stromata* of Clemens Alexandrinus, which appeared, to M. Champollion, to speak so clearly in favour of his theory, that he was afraid of trusting to his own interpretation, and therefore applied to M. Letronne, whose critical knowledge of the Greek language has been so clearly proved by his “*Recherches pour servir à l’histoire de l’Egypte*.”—*Αὐτίκα οἱ παρ’ Αἰγυπτίοις παιδευόμενοι*, says Clemens (*Strom.* V. 657. Ed. Potter), *πρῶτον μὲν πάντων τὴν Αἰγυπτίων γραμμάτων μέθοδον ἐκμανθάνουσι, τὴν ἘΠΙΣΤΟΛΟΓΡΑΦΙΚΗΝ καλουμένην· δεύτερον δὲ, τὴν ἹΕΡΑΤΙΚΗΝ, ἣν χρῶνται οἱ ἱερογραμματεῖς· ὑστέρη δὲ καὶ τελευταίαν τὴν ἹΕΡΟΓΛΥΦΙΚΗΝ, ἥς ἢ μὲν ἐστὶ διὰ τῶν ΠΡΩΤΩΝ ΣΤΟΙΧΕΙΩΝ ΚΥΡΙΟΛΟΓΙΚΗ; ἢ δὲ ΣΥΜΒΟΛΙΚΗ. Τῆς δὲ ΣΥΜΒΟΛΙΚΗΣ ἢ μὲν ΚΥΡΙΟΛΟΓΕΙΤΑΙ ΚΑΤΑ ΜΙΜΗΣΙΝ, ἢ δ’ ὥσπερ ΤΡΟΠΙΚΩΣ γράφεται, ἢ δ’ ἀντικρὺς ἀλληγορεῖται ΚΑΤΑ ΤΙΝΑΣ*

ἌΙΝΙΓΜΟΥΣ. Ἡλιον γοῦν γράψαι βουλόμενοι κύκλον ποιούσι, σελήνην δὲ σχῆμα μηνοειδὲς, ΚΑΤΑ ΤΟ ΚΥΡΙΟΛΟΓΟΥΜΕΝΟΝ ἜΙΔΟΣ· ΤΡΟΠΙΚΩΣ δὲ κατ' οἰκειότητα μεταγόνιες καὶ μετατιθέντες, τὰ δ' ἐξαλλάττοντες, τὰ δὲ πολλαχῶς μετασχηματίζοντες χαράττουσιν. Τοὺς γοῦν τῶν βασιλέων ἐπαίνους θεολογουμένοις μύθοις παραδίδοντες ἀναγράφουσι διὰ τῶν ἈΝΑΓΛΥΦΩΝ. Τοῦ δὲ ΚΑΤΑ ΤΟΥΣ ἌΙΝΙΓΜΟΥΣ τρίτου εἶδους δεῖγμα ἔστω τόδε· τὰ μὲν γὰρ τῶν ἄλλων ἀστρων, διὰ τὴν πορείαν τὴν λοξὴν ὅφρων σώμασιν ἀπείκαζον, τὸν δὲ Ἡλιον τῷ τοῦ κανθάρου. This remarkable passage, which was strangely misunderstood by Warburton, though his sagacity showed him what it ought to signify, (Bailey, Hieroglyph. Origo et Natura. n. 1. p. 32), is thus rendered by M. Letronne : Ceux qui parmi les Egyptiens reçoivent de l'instruction, apprennent d'abord le genre d'écriture égyptienne qu'on appelle *épistolographique* : [ils apprennent] en second lieu *l'hiératique*, dont se servent les hiérogammates ; et enfin *l'hiéroglyphique*. L'hiéroglyphique [est de deux genres], l'un exprimant *au propre les objets par LES LETTRES*, l'autre les représentant par des symboles. L'hiéroglyphique SYMBOLIQUE [se subdivise en plusieurs espèces] : l'une représente les objets *au propre par imitation* ; l'autre les exprime *tropiquement* ; la troisième, au contraire, les rappelle au moyen de certaines allégories énigmatiques. Ainsi, d'après la méthode *de représenter les objets au propre*, les Egyptiens veulent-ils écrire *le soleil*, ils font un *cercle* ; la *lune*, ils tracent la figure d'un *croissant*. Dans la méthode *tropique*, ils représentent les objets au moyen d'analogies (ou de propriétés semblables), qu'ils transportent dans l'expression de ces objets, tantôt par des modifications [de forme], tantôt et plus souvent par des transformations totales. Ainsi, ils représentent par des *anaglyphes* [bas-reliefs allégoriques], les louanges de leurs rois, quand ils veulent les faire connaître au moyen de mythes religieux. Voici un exemple de la troisième espèce [d'écriture hiéroglyphique] qui emploie des allusions *énigmatiques* : les Egyptiens figurent les *astres* [planétaires] par un *serpent*, à cause de l'obliquité de leur course ; mais le *soleil* est figuré par un *scarabée*.

M. Letronne has shown in his commentary on this passage (Precis, 329—401.), that the three kinds of writing mentioned by Clemens, the epistolographic, hieratic, and hieroglyphic, correspond exactly with the two named by Herodotus, Diodorus and the Rosetta Inscription ; for the first, which “expressed objects as they are, without figure or metaphor, by means of the letters of the alphabet,” is manifestly the *demotic* of Herodotus and Diodorus, and the *enchorial* of the Rosetta Stone : the second and third, which are “the sacred letters” spoken of by the two historians, are the hieroglyphics of the Inscription. He also proves by a

passage from Plutarch (Symp. IX. 3) that by "the first letters of the alphabet," Clemens means those borrowed from the Phœnicians by Cadmus, which are the very letters for which M. Champollion's researches have found hieroglyphical representatives in the Egyptian papyri and inscriptions. The sub-division of the hieroglyphics into the Cyriologic, forming the first letters of the alphabet; and the symbolic, which are again subdivided into three classes, also strongly corroborates M. Champollion's theory, and furnishes an exact counterpart of his (1) *representative* hieroglyphics (*caractères purement figuratifs*) and of his (2) *symbolical*, or *tropical* ones; while the (3) *anaglyphs* are allegorical delineations, and bas-reliefs not strictly hieroglyphical, being usually accompanied by explanations in the latter characters (p. 301). The testimony of Clemens, therefore, who, as a Pagan, had been instructed "in all the wisdom of Egypt," not only confirms the theory delivered in the *Précis*, but explains what the Ancients meant by the alphabetical characters of the Egyptians.

M. Champollion, after examining what the Greek writers have said on this subject, (§. ix. 327—334), proceeds to point out (§. x. 334—350) the peculiar use of these different kinds of hieroglyphics. They are intermingled, he observes, in almost every possible way: the same word exhibiting in the same page either a combination of all three, or an example of each taken separately: thus we have (1) the jar and the goat; (2) jar, bird and goat; jar, bird, and goat-headed image, or the same image alone, as the expression for Nûb (Chnuphis). Memphis is represented by a Temple placed beside the letters, P, T, H, signifying "the sanctuary of Phthah," 'Hephæstopolis,' as it might be supposed the Greeks would have called it; for most of the similar names given by them to Egyptian cities, seem to be translations of the sacred names of those places, the common ones, which were quite different, having been preserved by the Arabs:—hence Shmin was called Panopolis; Shmûn, Hermopolis; On, Heliopolis; Osyût, Lycopolis, &c. The grammatical forms, terminations, affixes, prefixes, &c., are always expressed by phonetic hieroglyphics; and generally by the same characters. Ordinary proper names are distinguished by a generic representative character, subjoined; thus O S R T S N, followed by the figure of a man, (Pl. x. p. 197), signifies "the man Osortasen." S T E placed before the figure of a woman, signifies, "the woman Sate or Sati," (Satis.) A leg, cap, ring and lituus, before the hieroglyphic of "a God," signify "the God Bennô;" a feather, cap, fasces and bird before the same figure, signify "the God Anebô (Anubis)." The hieroglyphic characters, also, are never united, except through the whim or haste of the writer. (p. 347.)

It has been already remarked that in the papyri, and occasionally on stones and mummy-cases, another kind of writing is found, apparently quite distinct from the hieroglyphics. This, as was long since observed, must be the Epistolographic or *demotic*, and Dr. Young, by a careful examination of the Rosetta Inscription, had the merit of ascertaining, what no one ever suspected before, that it is merely a degradation of the hieroglyphics, notwithstanding their apparent dissimilarity. M. Champollion, treading in his steps, and enjoying the very great advantage of having nothing to distract his attention, advanced still further, and discovered that the *hieratic* is much more nearly allied to the demotic than the linear hieroglyphic, supposed by Dr. Young to be the character used by the sacred scribes, (*ἱερογραμματεῖς*). In one section of the *Précis* (ch. ix. § 11. p. 350—366) therefore, the special purposes for which these two characters were used, and the peculiarities which distinguish them, are more fully investigated. The hieroglyphics, in their perfect form, were too cumbersome and difficult of delineation for general use: the (1) *outline*, consequently, or slight sketch, was substituted as soon as writings of any length became requisite. These outlines are exact counterparts of their prototypes, differing merely in finish. But the desire of greater rapidity in execution, soon produced a further and more considerable modification of the original forms, and gave rise to the (2) *hieratic* or sacerdotal character, in which the sacred hymns were written. Some of the figures used in this character are entirely arbitrary, and the rest are such imperfect sketches of their prototypes as to be recognized with difficulty. It was therefore necessary in this mode of writing, to guard against the introduction of new or unusual forms, and accordingly, it is found that the number of phonetic characters used in it, is much greater than that of the symbolic or representative ones. Abbreviated and rapid as this hand appears, when compared even with the linear hieroglyphics, it was still too complicated to be fit for the common business of life. A further reduction, was therefore again made, more simple in form and more rapid in execution; and this was called, from its peculiar use and design, the *demotic*, or popular hand. In it the most common of the sacred characters were adopted; almost all phonetic, with few duplicates; so that of all the modes of writing used in Egypt, it is the simplest and most expeditious, and approximates most nearly to an alphabetical character. This explains at once why it was the character first taught by the Egyptians, and shows that Clemens has mentioned their different kinds of writing in the order in which they were learnt, not according to priority of invention.

If any part of the Egyptian paintings and sculptures was really mysterious and unintelligible to all except the initiated, it must have been the *Anaglyphs* or allegorical bas-reliefs, many of which were designed to preserve the knowledge of their theology and the history of their gods. Yet even these representations, though more intricate and complicated, were formed on the same principle, and had much that was common to other hieroglyphical delineations. These fantastic assemblages of incongruous—for such the anaglyphs commonly are—and arbitrary symbols, are by good luck precisely those of which illustrations may be drawn from the writings of the ancients. It is in such inexplicable bas-reliefs that most of the hieroglyphics explained by Horapollo, are found; and the interpretation of such mysterious figures was evidently his principal object. The ordinary forms and obvious symbols were known to every one; to explain them, would have been lost labour: but the rare and unintelligible combinations could be understood only by a few: they consequently were the only subjects upon which an Egyptian would think it worth his while to comment. It is manifest also that such a dictionary of hard words in hieroglyphics, would be of no use to a beginner, without a grammar and vocabulary; and the want of observing this plain truth has been the occasion of all the contempt and abuse cast upon Horapollo, and of the small advantage derived by the moderns from his labours.

M. Champollion concludes his work by a very able and interesting recapitulation (ch. x. p. 366—400) of all the most important topics discussed in it; beginning by a review of the attempts of his predecessors, and ending by a succinct, but luminous statement of the result of his own more successful researches. To Dr. Young he readily gives credit for having first determined the real meaning of a certain number of hieroglyphics, and for having “recognized the close connexion which exists between the running-hand of the papyri and the hieroglyphic writing:” but when he adds (p. 377), “Mais ce savant laborieux confondit en une seule deux écritures essentiellement différentes, l’*hiéroglyphique* et la *démotique*; il ne démêla point le principe phonétique qui est en quelque sorte l’âme des trois sortes d’écritures Égyptiennes, quoique ce même savant eût essayé d’analyser phonétiquement les deux noms propres hiéroglyphiques Ptolémée et Bérénice;” a lurking inclination to undervalue the aid by which he was enabled to do so much, seems unintentionally to betray itself. He forgets to mention that, in 1815, Dr. Young distinctly declared his conviction that (1) the enchorial characters were bastard hieroglyphics; that (2) many objects were represented by their actual delineations, that (3) many were used in a

figurative sense only; while others were arbitrary symbols; that (4) the numbers were indicated by a sort of cypher; that (5) proper names were enclosed in an oval ring or border, and that (6) the name of Ptolemy only existed in the hieroglyphics on the Rosetta pillar. (Young's Discov. in Hierogl. Lit. 334.) The connection also between the hieroglyphic and alphabetic characters is pointed out, if we mistake not, in the Supplement to the Encycl. Brit. (iv. 54) published in 1819, and certainly in the Appendix to Belzoni's Travels (503), printed in the very year in which M. Champollion's first *Mémoire* was read to the Royal Academy of Belles Lettres. Is it, moreover, quite certain, that these demotic and hieratic characters are really different? The specimens hitherto produced do not, we confess, convey to the mind that entire conviction which is requisite to justify such an exulting tone as M. Champollion seems in some places to assume. In this, and in some other points of a more general interest, a cloud of doubt and uncertainty still hangs over his speculations: especially with regard to the chronological data derived from the names and titles of the Pharaohs, as read by the aid of his system.

This subject, occasionally introduced in the body of the *Précis*, but more fully developed in the Letters to the Duke de Blacas, in the appendixes to which the chronological questions are ably discussed by M. Champollion-Figeac, is connected with such weighty inquiries, that it would be impossible to do it justice within the limits to which this paper must be restricted. The sequel to those letters, however, will afford a future opportunity of examining these questions; and it will be sufficient for the present to add a brief statement of M. Champollion's observations; and of the inferences which, according to his brother's calculations, arise from them.

“La grande question de l'antiquité plus ou moins reculée des monumens de l'Égypte, soit temples, soit palais, tombeaux obélisques ou colosses, a été irrévocablement décidée par la découverte de l'alphabet des hiéroglyphes, phonétiques,” says M. Champollion le Jeune in (p. 386), in terms which may, perhaps, be thought rather too magnificent: and it will also be remembered that “the first discovery of the name of Cleopatra was made by Mr. W. J. Banks, in 1818.” (Salt's *Phonetic System of the Hierog.* p. 7.) This name which, “in a manner, furnished a key to all the rest,” was decyphered not from any vague conjectures as to the meaning of the hieroglyphics by which it is expressed, but by a regular chain of inferences, which would have escaped the notice of any ordinary observer. The continual recurrence in Egyptian bas-reliefs, of the *same* figure or pair

of figures, presenting offerings to the gods, led Mr. Banks to suppose that these must be "*conventional* portraits* of the founders" of those monuments. This conjecture was strongly corroborated by his finding a female figure, habited as Isis, on the cover of the sarcophagus, in one of the few tombs at Thebes, where a "female figure is represented singly throughout." Following up the same analogy, and remarking that, as in the Greek inscription on the Propylæum at Diospolis Parva, the name of Cleopatra precedes that of Ptolemy, so the female figure in the bas-reliefs precedes the male, he concluded that Ptolemy and Cleopatra must be the persons represented; and on comparing the name over the man's head with the scroll from the Rosetta stone furnished by Dr. Young, they were found exactly to agree. The same correspondence appeared on examining the obelisk removed from Philæ, and it was thence concluded that the scroll over the woman's head must contain the name of Cleopatra; an inference completely justified by an examination of the hieroglyphics, in which every letter common to both was expressed by the same sign in each; and no doubt could any longer remain as to the Egyptian mode of expressing Greek names. This was noted by Mr. Banks in the margin of a plate of that obelisk presented to the Institute. To that plate, he observes, M. Champollion refers his own discovery of this name; but the accompanying scroll on that obelisk contains the titles, and not the name of Cleopatra. M. Champollion, therefore, appears not to be entirely clear, in this respect, from a charge of disingenuousness: a circumstance the more to be lamented, as his skilful use of the hints afforded him, shows how little he stood in need of such an auxiliary.

But to return to the important results which he ascribes to his researches: "It has by these means," he says, (p. 387) "been ascertained that the following edifices are monuments of the wealth and piety of the Pharaohs, the native kings of Egypt:—the ruins at Sān (Tanis); the obelisk at Matariyyeh (Heliopolis); the Palace at El-ârabah (Abydos); a small temple at Denderah (Tentyris); various ruins at Carnac, El-ocsor, Med-âmud, and

* These bas-reliefs therefore, in Mr. Banks's opinion, were themselves symbolical; and to the very same conclusion had M. Champollion been led by his observations: "Les temples, comme leur nom égyptien l'indique, n'étaient si l'on peut, s'exprimer ainsi, que de grandes et magnifiques caractères représentatifs des demeures célestes: les statues, les images des rois et des simples particuliers, les bas-reliefs et les peintures qui retraçaient au propre les scènes de la vie publique et privée, rentraient pour ainsi dire dans la classe des caractères figuratifs; et les images des dieux, les emblèmes des idées abstraites, les ornemens et les peintures allégoriques, enfin la nombreuse série des *anaglyphes*, se rattachaient d'une manière directe au principe symbolique d'écriture proprement dite."—*Précis*, § 130, p. 365.

Cúrnah; the Memnonîum, and the palace called the Tomb of Osymandyas (on the site of Thebes); the Tombs at Bîbán-el-molúk; the Temples of Elephantine, and a very small part of those in Philæ. Structures erected by the same monarchs are found also in Nubia, at Calábisheh (Talmis); Ghirsheh (Tzitzis); Mohharracah (Hierosycaminon); Wádî's-sebúâ; Amadah; Derr; Ibsambul (Phthur?); and Ssoleb. Those which were built under the Greek and Roman princes are the Temple at Bahbeît (Isidis Oppidum); the Casr Kerun (near Assinoë); the Portico at Caw el Kebîr (Antæopolis); the great temple and typhonium at Denderah (Tentyris); the portico at Isnâ (Letopolis); the temple to the north of it; the temple and typhonium at Edfû (Apollonopolis); the temples at Kúm Ombô (Ombos); the largest edifices in Philæ; and the temples at Calábisheh, Dendûr and Dackeh in Nubia.

This alone is, certainly, a very important result, as it throws an unexpected light on the history not only of the arts and sciences, but also upon the civil and religious institutions of Egypt. Much more important however, if ultimately confirmed, are the data thus obtained for determining the chronology of the early Egyptian history.

That the names are correctly read and rightly interpreted, there can be no doubt. When we find in an Egyptian manuscript PTAMN used as a proper name, and learn that Petammon in Coptic signifies "the Ammonian," or "that which belongs to Ammon," we can have little doubt that this is the Egyptian word corresponding with Ammonius in Greek; but the supposition becomes a certainty on finding a mummy bearing the very same name, expressed in hieroglyphics, and explained in Greek by the words ΠΕΤΕΜΕΝΟΣ Ο ΚΑΙ ΑΜΜΩΝΙΟΣ. If, however, the names in the royal scrolls should not be found to agree with those mentioned by the ancient historians, we shall be compelled to pause, and wait for further evidence, before we give our assent to conclusions which, however plausible, cannot be admitted, if they rest on untenable premises.

The names of the Pharaohs ascertained by M. Champollion are these: 1. On the plinth of two sphinxes of basalt in the Royal Museum at Paris there are these inscriptions: i. The king of an obedient people, (approved by Cneph,) son of the Sun HAKR. ii. The king of an obedient people, (beloved by the Gods,) son of the Sun (NAI PHRVIS)*. Achoris, according to Manetho (xxixth dynasty,) (Acoris in Diodorus Siculus, xv. 2.) was son and successor of Nephereus, who reigned in Egypt B. C. 395. The agreement of these names with those on the

* See in Salt's Pl. iv. 17, 18. the same name from Ilithyias-polis.

sphinxes, (themselves symbols of kings,) both brought, no doubt, from the same temple, affords a strong presumption in favour of the supposition that they were the kings of whom these sphinxes are memorials (181—193). 2. The obelisk called Campensis, from the Campus Martius, in which it was erected, is ascribed by Pliny to one of the ancient Pharaohs: its scrolls express “the beneficent sun PSM TK.” Who can for a moment doubt that this is Psammetichus, one of the most powerful sovereigns of Egypt? The same name was found by Mr. Salt (before the publication of the *Précis*,) at Carnac and Ilithyias (Salt, Pl. iv. 30, 31.) 3. The name on the obelisk at Heliopolis (Matariyyeh, not far from Cairo,) is OSRTSN; and a monumental figure in the possession of M. Durand, has two inscriptions relative to a king bearing that name, in one of which he is termed “King OSRTSN, beloved by king Pjam, (Psammûs,) the beloved by Ammon.” On another monumental column, “OSRTSN, son of PTHF,” is found.* This, therefore, must be King Osortasen, son of Phthahoph, or Phthahophtep, (tasted by Phthah.) Now, if we consult Manetho’s lists, we find that Petubas, or Petubastes, and his son Osorthos, or Osorthon, were the first and second kings of the 23d dynasty. (196—203.) Another column, brought from Egypt by M. Thédénat du Vent, has a figure subscribed “AMNM (Pjam) she t(she) OSRTSN,” i. e. “beloved by Ammon, Psammûs, the son of Osorthos;” but according to the authority cited above, Psammus was son and successor of Osorthos, and last of the 23d or Tanitic dynasty. 4. One of the colonnades which adorn the first court of the great palace at Thebes bears a royal scroll, containing these words, “Ammon-me SHSHNK,” i. e. “beloved by Ammon Sheshonk.” Have we not here the Sesonchis of Manetho, (first king of the 22d dynasty,) and the Shishac of Scripture, (1 Kings, xiv. 25.) who invaded Judea B. C. 971? His successor, according to Manetho, was Osorchon; and another scroll near this, contains the words “Beloved by Ammon, OSRKEN,” evidently the Osorkhon of the historian, and perhaps, as M. Champollion thinks, the Zerah who was defeated by Asa (2 Chron. xiv. 9.) B. C. 941. A papyrus, brought from Egypt by Denon, commemorates “the Purified by Ammon Re (Aruëris) Sovereign of the Gods, Osorkon, son of Sheshonk, life-giving king, tried by Anebô (Anubis).” Another part of the same papyrus shows that the father of Sesonchis

* On one of these columns his mother is named Ran, and on another she is also represented; but the inscription on the latter, as engraved by M. Champollion (Pl. x. 7.), is only “Mout neb-eï nanes-f” (his gracious mother, lady of the house), her name *Ran* not being added, as he says it is (199). This is not the only place in which his plates do not correspond exactly with his text.

was also named Osorchon. The oval border round the name of the grandfather is remarkable, inasmuch as he never sat upon the throne, nor is he here termed *King*, though honoured with other royal titles. A sphinx, preserved in the British Museum, is also commemorative of this celebrated prince. 5. The name which occurs most frequently on the finest monuments of Egyptian art is Ramses, which immediately recalls the names of Rhameses, Ramesses, or Ramestes, and Raâmses, (Exod. i. 11.) occurring in Hebrew, Greek, and Roman writers; and when we find this name with all its adjuncts, distinguishing some of the finest remains of antiquity from the extremity of Nubia to the shores of the Mediterranean, we are immediately led to ask whether this must not have been the title of Sesostris? The Flaminian obelisk at Rome, its copy the Salustian, the Mahutean, and Medicean, in the same place; those at El-Osor, the ancient Thebes, and a bilingual inscription at Nahr-el-kelb, in Syria, all bear this legend: the power and dominions of this prince must therefore have been of no ordinary magnitude; and such was in truth that of the Rhameses, whom the priests at Thebes described to Germanicus as the greatest conqueror who ever lived (Tacit. Annal. ii. p. 78. ed. Elzevir. 1649.) But none of the ancient historians give this name to Sesostris. He is however called Sethos by Manetho, who tells us (Joseph. contra Apion. i. p. 1053.) that he was also called *Rhamesses*, from his grandfather Rhampses," and thus affords a clue by which all doubt is removed; and as Sethos, Sesos-tris, and Sesos-is, are virtually the same name, and confessedly belong to the same person, so was the Rhameses of Tacitus, and the REMSS of these hieroglyphic inscriptions, no other than that mighty conqueror. His grandfather is called Rhameses Meïammûn by Manetho (15th king of the 18th dynasty), and that name appears on the great palace of Medînet-âbû and some other buildings in the ruins of Thebes: but the one is always named Ramses Ammon-meï, and has distinctive titles different from those of the other. This is alone sufficient to identify them; for as the Ptolemies were distinguished by their surnames, Philadelphus, Epiphanes, Soter, &c.; so were the ancient Egyptian kings by their peculiar titles, as is manifest from the double scrolls by which their names are usually expressed. From the tomb of Ramses Meï-ammûn, in the Bibân-el-mulûk, Mr. Belzoni brought the cover of his sarcophagus of red granite, ornamented with a recumbent figure of the deceased king in the character of Osiris. It is now preserved in the Fitz-William Museum, at Cambridge, to which it was presented by that justly regretted traveller. 6. Amenophis II. (8th king of the 18th dynasty,) was "supposed to be Memnon," says

Manetho; and accordingly, on the throne of the celebrated vocal statue, which its many Greek inscriptions tell us is the Memnon of the ancients, there is a royal legend stating that this "Child of the Sun, *Amenoph*, was Lord by the aid of *Rè* and *Satis* (*Juno*)," i. e. that this sovereign was named *Amenoph*, just as one of the metrical inscriptions celebrates him as "*Memnon*, also called *Phamenoph*." The latter is the same name with the article (*phi*) prefixed, and it is an abridgment of *Amenephthep*, converted by the Greeks into *Amenephthes*. (233—240.) These examples taken from the *Précis* will show how happily various authorities conspire to show that the names of the Pharaohs have been correctly read, and that their appropriate titles, like those of the Chinese emperors, serve to distinguish such as bore the same names.

What was successfully begun in the *Précis*, has been ably continued in the two letters to the Duc de Blacas. In the first, sepulchral monuments, scarabæi, and other memorials of Manetho's 18th dynasty, are examined: and in the second, those relating to the 16th, 17th, 19th, 20th, and 21st. For the interesting details respecting these monuments, given by M. Champollion, the reader must be referred to the letters themselves. A very brief review of the chronological data afforded by them, is all that can be added here. It should also be mentioned that the greater number of them belong to the splendid collection formed by M. Drovetti, formerly French Consul in Egypt, and lately purchased by the King of Sardinia for the Royal Museum at Turin.

There are two elements which afford certain data for one of the epochs in early Egyptian history: 1. The Sothic period, or Cynic cycle, of 1460 years consisting of 365 $\frac{1}{4}$ days, one revolution of which terminated in A.D. 138: and 2. The era of Menophres, mentioned in an unpublished commentary by Theon on Ptolemy's *Almagest*. The latter is preferred by M. Champollion Figeac in the "*Notice Chronologique*" appended to his brother's letters, as more convenient for the present purpose: but the two eras prove to be one and the same: and as it is highly probable that the latter was named from Menophres, on account of its having commenced in his reign: we may conclude that he sat upon the throne of Egypt B.C. 1322. Ammenephthes, or Amenophis, the 3d king of Manetho's 19th dynasty, appears to M. Champollion to be the Menophres of Theon. But the same historian (Georgii Syncelli Chronog.) fixes the invasion of Egypt by the shepherds in the 6th year of Concharis, and in the 700th of the preceding period of the Cynic cycle. By putting these dates together, therefore, we may ascertain in what year of the reign of Amenophis the period named from him began.

| | |
|---|-------|
| Years of the Cycle elapsed | 700 |
| Reign of Shepherd Kings | 260 |
| Duration of the 18th Dynasty | 348 |
| Reign of Sesostris, first king of the 19th Dynasty | 55 |
| Reign of Ramses II. second ditto | 66 |
| | <hr/> |
| | 1429 |
| Beginning of reign of Amenophis | 31 |
| | <hr/> |
| | 1460 |

It is plain, therefore, that the period of the Cynic cycle, which Theon calls the cycle of Menophres, began in the 32d year of Amenoph, whose name approaches nearly to that given in the MSS.* This is the basis of M. Champollion Figeac's calculations; and after carefully discussing the discordances with respect to some reigns found in the different extracts from Manetho, and rejecting the false interpretations put upon that historian's words by Josephus (1st letter, 104.), he constructs the following Table, which will appear of no trifling interest to those who pay attention to chronological enquiries.

XVIth DYNASTY.

| Name. | B. C. |
|---|-------|
| Osymandyas | 2272 |
| Two kings not named | 2222 |
| Amesses, or Amosis | 2113 |
| Timäus, or Concharis | 2088 |
| Invasion of the Hycsos, or Shepherd kings | 2082 |

XVIIth DYNASTY.

| Pharaohs. | Shepherd Kings. | |
|--|---|------|
| 1 (1st Scroll in the Geneal. Table at Abydos) } | Salatis | 2082 |
| 2. Ammeneme Pi | Bæon | 2063 |
| 3. (3d Scroll) | Apachnis | 2019 |
| 4. (4th ———) | Apochis, or Apophis | 1983 |
| 5. (5th ———) | Janias | 1922 |
| 6. (6th ———) Amosis or Mispfrag-Muthosis } | Assis, or Asseth expelled by Amosis. | 1872 |

XVIIIth DYNASTY.

| Greek Names, | Egyptian Names. | |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------|------|
| Amosis, or Thoutmosis | (Amenoftep) | 1822 |
| Chebron | (Thoutmes I.) | 1791 |
| Amenophis I. | (Amen-meï) | 1778 |
| Amenses | (Amensè) | 1757 |
| Miphres, or Mæris | (Thoutmes II.) | 1736 |

* If Ré (the Sun) be added, we have Amenophrè almost letter for letter, the name given by Theon.

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|------|
| Miphra-Thoutmosis | (Amenof I.) | 1723 |
| Thoutmosis | (Thoutmes III.) | 1697 |
| Amenophis II. | (Amenof II.) | 1687 |
| Horus | (Hôr) | 1657 |
| Acencheres | (Tmauhmot) | 1618 |
| Rathotis, or Athoris | (Ramses I.) | 1606 |
| Achencheres I. | (Osireï) | 1597 |
| Achencheres II. | (Mandueï) | 1585 |
| Armais, or Armes | (Ramses II.) | 1565 |
| Ramesses | (Ramses III.) | 1561 |
| Ramesses Meiamûn | (Ramses IV.) | 1559 |
| Amenophis III. Ramesses | (Ramses V.) | 1493 |

XIXth DYNASTY.

| | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------|
| Sethos, or Sesostris | (Ramses VI.) | 1473 |
| Rampses, or Pheron | (Ramses VII.) | 1418 |
| Amenephthes, or Menophres | (Amenoftep IV.) | 1352 |
| Rameses | (Ramses VIII.) | 1312 |
| Ammenemes | (Ramses IX. Amenmé) | 1291 |
| Thuôris or Polybus | (Ramses X.) | 1286 |

XXth DYNASTY.

| | |
|---|------|
| Nechepsos | 1279 |
| with his two successors reigned 178 years | |

XXIst DYNASTY.

| | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|------|
| Mendes, or Smendis | (Mandûftep) | 1101 |
| Psûsenes I. | | 1075 |
| Nephelcheres | | 1029 |
| Amenophthis | | 1025 |
| Osochôr | | 1016 |
| Psinaches | | 1010 |
| Psûsenes II. | (Oosen) | 1001 |

XXIInd DYNASTY.

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------|-----|
| Sesonchosis, or Shishak | (Sheshonk) | 971 |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------|-----|

With regard to these dynasties, we may add, that Arthoût, one of the kings of the 20th dynasty, is the Pharaoh whose sarcophagus is preserved in the British Museum, and supposed to be the tomb of Alexander; and that the Egyptian names have been determined by "the Genealogical Table" found by Mr. Banks, while making excavations "for the purpose of obtaining an accurate ground plan of the extensive ruins at Abydos." It is on the wall of a smaller building than the Memnonium, from which the former is quite distinct, and is a Table containing three horizontal and parallel rows of royal scrolls or legends: the two upper ones (of which the uppermost is imperfect) contain only the distinctive titles; the lowest both the title and proper name of Sesostris,

(Ramses Ammon-mci,) in whose reign this sculpture was doubtless made. M. Champollion was indebted for his copy of this most invaluable monument to M. Cailliaud, and does not seem to have heard of Mr. Bankes's, which was engraved soon after his return to England, in 1819. The thirteen scrolls immediately preceding that of Sesostris, proved, by comparison with other monuments, to be those of his immediate predecessors (*Précis*, 245-6. *Prem. Lettre*. 15.); and it was, therefore, in all probability, when perfect, a complete genealogy of the early Egyptian kings. As this is M. Champollion's main stay in the chronological parts of his work, it is right to observe that in the upper row, his copy differs from that given by Mr. Bankes, the third scroll from the end of that line in the latter being omitted in the former: as that, however, is finished with most care, it is probably the most correct, though in such a case subtraction is more likely to arise from haste than addition. If the error rest with Mr. Bankes, the speculations of M. Champollion will not need any modification; but if the error is in M. Cailliaud's copy, it would materially affect his determination of the kings belonging to the preceding dynasties. Of the 16th, however, he has noted only one prince, and *his* title does not appear on the Table of Abydos. Another remark, which M. Champollion's chronology suggests, arises from the date assigned to the reign of Sesostris. Mæris, the immediate predecessor of that prince, died, according to Herodotus (ii. 13.), not quite 900 years before he visited Memphis, i. e. before 460 B. C. Sesostris therefore ascended the throne a few years later than 1360 B. C., about 120 years after the period assigned above. But the testimony of Herodotus, who lived so long before Manetho, ought surely to be well weighed, before it is rejected.

ART. XI.—*A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of London, at the Visitation in July, 1826.* By William, Lord Bishop of London. 4to. 2s. Rivingtons. 1826.

EPISCOPAL charges are, unquestionably, very valuable documents; such of them, at least, as bear any considerable resemblance to the one now before us. It is most heartily to be wished, not only that every clergyman in the diocese of London, but that every intelligent layman, would provide himself with a copy of this address, as it touches on many topics of high interest and importance, and exemplifies most of the excellencies appropriate to compositions of this nature. Its style is chaste, perspicuous and dignified; its temper singularly moderate, though without the

slightest approach towards the sacrifice of any momentous principle. It speaks, indeed, as it ought, *with authority*; softened, however, by that paternal tone which becomes a spiritual father of the Christian family. For the benefit of those of our readers who may be without an opportunity of perusing it, we subjoin a few extracts, which cannot but be acceptable to all, who have a truly filial attachment to the church.

The Bishop, having first adverted to "some points of ecclesiastical regulation, relating to the parochial clergy," proceeds to notice the revival of the controversy with the Romish Church. We gladly insert the whole of his remarks on that subject, because they exhibit the "meekness of wisdom" in its perfection.

"In respect to her external relations, the affairs of the Church have proceeded not unsatisfactorily since our last meeting. Among the most remarkable events which have occurred during that period, is the revival of controversy respecting the pretensions and doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church, which, in this country at least, had ceased for many years to excite any degree of attention. The weakness of the grounds on which that Church rests her claims to spiritual sovereignty over Christendom, the authority which she assigns to tradition as a rule of faith, and the unscriptural character of many of those doctrines which she imposes on the belief of Christians, had been so clearly demonstrated by the early Reformers, and again by our divines after the Restoration, as to satisfy the nation at large of the necessity of separating from a communion, which required the sacrifice of liberty and truth by the acknowledgment of an usurped power, and the profession of a corrupt faith. The arguments on both sides having been sifted again and again, and placed in every different view, the discussions were gradually discontinued, or, if renewed from time to time by the zeal of divines, excited little interest. A long and active hostility subsided into a virtual truce: the Protestant laid down his arms in the confidence of victory, and the Roman Catholic was unwilling to renew an attack, from which, though firm in his persuasion, he had been taught by experience to expect no beneficial result. In consequence of this mutual forbearance, the reasons of our separation from Rome, and the real principles of the Roman Catholic Church, which once had been generally known, were no longer familiar to the public; and many persons were led to imagine, that a change had been insensibly wrought in her system, that she had modified her objectionable tenets, had become more tolerant to Christians of other persuasions, and was disposed, if not formally to disavow her exclusive pretensions, yet to abstain from pressing them. It is true, that the principles which were taught in her schools of divinity, as well as the public documents put forth by her highest authorities, contradicted this charitable supposition; but few persons would be at the trouble of examining lectures in theology, and it was said, with some show of probability, that official papers must speak the language of form, which is prescribed by ancient usage, and is not always to be understood in its strict sense. The silence has however been broken; and the question at issue between the Reformers

and the Roman Catholic Church has been warmly debated on religious grounds, and, on both sides, with no mean ability. Of the issue of such a controversy, even had the cause of truth been defended with less power of reason and eloquence than was displayed on this occasion, there could be little doubt. In the estimation at least of every Protestant, our adversaries have equally failed in the proof of their charges against our National Church, and in the defence of their own. It is not my intention to enter into the general question, any branch of which is too large for the present occasion, and which has been ably and amply discussed in publications which are in the hands of every one. The point to which I would draw your attention, is the light which has been thrown, in the result of the controversy, on the character of the Romish Church; the utter disproof of any alteration, or even the possibility of alteration, in her principles, claims, or doctrines. Whatever difference of opinion, under the connivance, if not the allowance, of her rulers, may be tolerated, in some respects and in some countries, all her Divines of any authority agree in asserting, that she alone, with the successor of St. Peter at her head, the representative of Christ upon earth, is the one, holy, catholic, and apostolic Church, out of whose bosom there is no salvation; that to her all Churches are subject, as their mother and mistress; the parent to whom they are indebted for their being; the sovereign from whom they derive their authority, and to whom their allegiance is due; that in virtue of the promises of Christ and the continual assistance of his Spirit, she is infallible, exempt from the possibility of error, in matters of faith, and authorized to enforce her decisions on the conscience of all Christians. The unity of faith, of worship, of government, all drawn to a point under the supremacy of the Pope, is essential to the constitution of her church, and admits of no impeachment. Her authority she cannot renounce in the slightest particular, because, emanating from Christ, as a trust to be exercised for the good of mankind, it is inherent and inalienable; nor can she subject her doctrines to revision, because infallibility precludes aberration from truth, and truth is incapable of variation. The system of doctrine which she is thus engaged to maintain, has been long since defined and established, by the Council of Trent, and the creed of Pius the IVth. which latter embodies the peculiar doctrines rejected by Protestants, and enjoins, under pain of damnation, their reception by every Christian, together with implicit belief of all that is held by the Romish Church, and the renunciation of all opposite errors. To this must be added, her utter rejection of any distinction of doctrines into *fundamental* or *not fundamental*: she regards not the importance of the doctrine: it is the slight to her authority which subjects the offender to anathema, for the obvious reason, that by impugning her judgment on the most insignificant point, he questions her pretence to infallibility. This is in effect the great strength of the Romish Church, the principle which cements the system of error, and prevents it from falling into ruin. It is this ‘sacred inflexibility,’ as it is termed by her advocates, ‘her incompatibility with any error whatsoever,’—in other words, her determined adherence to the whole body of doctrines, whether true or false, which she has once made part of her creed,—which constitutes her principal security. Hence she disclaims all compromise

in questions relating to her hierarchy or articles of faith, and denies the privileges and even the name of a Church, to every Christian community, and the hope of salvation to all individuals who refuse subjection to her authority. I do not accuse her of uncharitableness on account of this exclusive spirit : the authority which she believes to have been conferred on her by Christ, it is her duty to exercise : the privileges received at His hands, she is not at liberty to relinquish : the faith delivered to her custody, she is bound to maintain in its integrity : and, if separation from her communion involves the guilt of apostacy and the forfeiture of the promises of salvation, she is under a sacred obligation to lift up her voice, and warn mankind of their danger. But, the more firmly she is persuaded of her divine right, and disposed to act in accordance with it, the more incumbent is it on those who deny her authority, and think they are able to prove that she not only is liable to error, but has grievously erred, in matters of faith, to be sure of the grounds on which they form their conclusions and assert their independence. Where such are the pretensions advanced, the truth or the falsehood of particular articles of faith becomes a secondary question. If Christ has appointed the Church of Rome the exclusive possessor of his promises, the sole depository of his authority, the infallible judge in controversies regarding the faith, it is useless to debate on other matters. If this point is decided in her favour, our only resource is to acknowledge our errors, to sue for reconciliation, and accept the system of doctrines, which is proved to be true by her sanction.

“ In these statements, it is far from my intention to excite angry feelings. My object has simply been, to explain, in exact consistency with truth, and without unnecessary harshness of language, the actual position which the Church of Rome has assumed in regard to the Churches which disclaim her authority, and the consequences which flow from her pretensions. Other Churches may differ from us in points of importance ; may reproach us with defects and corruptions, and think it right to abstain from our communion. The Romish Church asserts a title to privileges, which, if they really belong to her, cut us off from connection with Christ, and place us, as rebels, usurpers, and apostates, out of the pale of the Christian Church. Other Churches, if they fall into error, may be corrected by time and reason. The obnoxious tenets of many Christian sects have either been dropped from their confessions, or have silently sunk into oblivion. But the errors of Rome are imperishable ; they derive from her principles the character of immutability which belongs to divine truth, and are asserted with equal confidence.

“ When we are acquainted with the true state of the controversy, we may form our own conclusions, and these will undoubtedly lead us, as faithful sons of a Church, which neither in purity of doctrine, nor holiness of worship, nor the apostolical succession of its ministers, is inferior to any other Christian Church, with calmness and steadiness to resist an usurpation which would despoil us at once of our faith, our liberties, and our sacred character. And how is this to be done ?—Not surely by retaliating mis-statements, invectives, and calumnies, or crudely asserting an unqualified right of private judgment, but by reference to primitive antiquity : disproving the allegations of our opponents from the silence of

Scripture, of general tradition, of ancient writers, which in a case of this nature* is decisive; appealing to the proceedings of Emperors, the acts of Councils, the language of Fathers, of Bishops, and even of Popes, which contradict the pretensions of the Papacy; and tracing the growth of this ecclesiastical tyranny from its rise after the division of the empire, till it attained to its height towards the close of the eleventh century. The Holy Scriptures, and the genuine records of ancient usage and practice, will in like manner supply us with proof of the real authority, the legitimate privileges conferred on the Church, and derived immediately from Christ on all particular Churches, which are true members of his body. And if we enter on our charge with that sense of its dignity, and humble reliance on aid from above, which we cannot but feel, if we are assured of our mission from Christ, and the truth of his promises to the Church, we may hope for the satisfaction of confuting our adversaries of every description, not only by unanswerable arguments, but by the power of the spirit of God appearing in the fruits of our ministry.”—p. 8. 13.

‘ We will not, ourselves, depart from the spirit in which this passage is conceived, by comparing it with the temper which, of late especially, has marked the language and the proceedings of our adversaries. It would be difficult to institute such a comparison without losing something of that composure which the Bishop so powerfully recommends by his own example. We will confine ourselves to the expression of a wish, that, whatever may be the fate of the great political question connected with this controversy, the bitterness of the discussions arising out of it may be assuaged by some infusion of that truly Christian mildness which pervades this charge.

After some brief and judicious observations on the opposition which the clergy must always have to encounter “from the attacks of dissent, infidelity and fanaticism,” we have the following impressive admonition, respecting the only weapons fit for that warfare. We give the passage, because, in a very few words, it

* “ ‘ If it be objected, that these discourses are negative, and therefore of small force, I answer that therefore they are most proper to assert such a negative proposition; for how can we otherwise show a thing not to be, than by showing it to have no footstep there, where it is supposed to stand? How can we more clearly argue a matter of right to want proof, than by declaring it not to be extant in the laws grounding such right, not taught by the masters who profess to instruct in such things, not testified in records concerning the exercise of it? Such arguments indeed in such cases are not merely negative, but rather privative; proving things not to be, because not affirmed there, where in reason they ought to be affirmed; standing therefore upon positive suppositions that Holy Scripture, that general tradition are not imperfect and lame toward their design; that ancient writers were competently intelligent, faithful, diligent; that all of them could not conspire in perpetual silence about things, of which they had often fair occasion and great reason to speak: in fine, such considerations, however they may be eluded by sophistical wits, will yet bear great sway, and often will amount near to the force of demonstration with men of honest prudence.’ These remarks are cited from Barrow, who has treated this part of the argument with his usual copiousness and power in his admirable treatise on the Pope’s Supremacy, a work which should be studied by every one who wishes to understand the subject thoroughly.”—See *Barrow’s Works*, v. 6. p. 202. Oxford, 1818.

recalls the ministers of Christianity to certain leading principles, which should never be absent from their thoughts ; and it does this in a style of calm solemnity much more likely to secure obedience, than a manner which savours of rebuke and accusation.

“ After all, the success of our ministry, the usefulness, I may say the existence, of the Establishment depends on our wisdom and diligence in performing the work of Evangelists towards that portion of the flock which is committed to our immediate care. Whilst the great body of the Clergy distributed through the kingdom, sustain, as they should do, in their several parishes, their appropriate character, as messengers and stewards of Christ, and by their personal conduct and attention to their ministerial and pastoral duties, deserve the love and respect of the people, the Church will never fall. It is therefore of the greatest importance that they should understand the nature of their obligations, and endeavour, both in their private and professional life, to fulfil them in their utmost extent. The eyes of the parishioners are constantly fixed on their Clergyman : however indulgent to themselves or their neighbours, they make no allowance for his failings ; they expect him, and not without reason, to set them a pattern of virtue and piety in his own person : they are quick in perceiving, and ready in censuring, any defect in his manner of performing the Church service, more especially if it proceeds from negligence : they are shocked if, on any occasion, he appears to be indifferent to the spiritual edification of his flock. In all these points, their feelings and judgment are correct and nice ; and the minister who fails of obtaining the personal respect, or fruit of his teaching, which might be expected from his character and ability, may generally trace the disappointment to some offence which has been taken at his failure in one of these respects. In truth, it is not enough that a Clergyman is chargeable with no vices, and acts with unexceptionable propriety in the ordinary concerns of life : nor will he obtain respect even by substantial virtues, unless he maintains the elevation and dignity of character which become a minister of Christ. The slightest departure from simplicity and gravity of conversation, whether it be affectation in dress or levity in behaviour, or inordinate fondness of amusements, is an indecency in his station ; and indiscretions, which may cast a shade of suspicion on his morals, will be altogether fatal to his usefulness. There may also be faults on the other side : severity and moroseness will alarm or offend, and make even piety unamiable ; and seriousness, though peculiarly suitable to the minister of the Gospel, may be carried to an excess, or shown in a manner, which will disgust persons of plain sense and sober piety.”
—pp. 15, 16.

In parishes, like many of those in London, whose inhabitants are reckoned by myriads, the occasional duties of the clergy are not only harassing to their spirits, and oppressive to their physical powers, but they are, by their perpetual recurrence, apt to endanger the devotional manner so necessary to give them their full effect. It is of course incumbent on a bishop to lift up his voice against a remissness which tends to sacrifice so much of the best influence which the Church can exercise over the public

mind. Let the minister who is most sorely burdened by occupations of this nature, attentively peruse the following words of our Diocesan; let him endeavour to recal them in the moment of impatience, weariness and exhaustion. We cannot doubt that the recollection of them would often rally his fainting spirits, and restore to the sacred formularies all that deep and solemn interest which they may have lost by incessant repetition.

“ Few things give greater offence, or create more estrangement from the Church, than a hasty and slovenly manner of performing the *occasional offices*. These seem to have been drawn up with an immediate view to effect on the minds of individuals, at a time when it is particularly desirable that they should receive good impressions. Thus in the *Office of Baptism*, the foundations of our faith, the terms of the Christian covenant, and the instruction to be given to children, are set forth so clearly and fully, that no one who listens with attention can be ignorant of his obligations to Christ, or his duty to his own family. The careless performance of the service defeats this good intention: the ceremony passes off as a matter of course, and is regarded as a mere formality. How beautifully, again, in the *Burial Service*, are the considerations of the frail tenure of life, the comfortable promises of immortality, and the certainty of a judgment to come, adapted to the state of the heart, when it is prepared by affliction to listen to the warnings, or to receive the consolations of religion! But the effect depends on the minister: if he is careless and cold, or shows signs of haste and impatience, the mourner who follows, in all the excitement of sorrow, the remains of a friend or relation to the grave, retires disappointed and grieved at an indifference so little in accordance with the awful ceremony, so offensive to his own feelings. This latter service, in particular, is often attended by those who are not in the habit of resorting to our places of public worship, and may sometimes afford the only occasion of awakening the conscience of the profane or immoral, or softening the prejudices of Dissenters. It is therefore the more to be lamented, that, through want of attention, it should ever produce a contrary effect. I will not conceal that I have occasionally heard complaints on these subjects; and though I am aware that in populous parishes the strength of the minister must be sometimes exhausted by the incessant recurrence of these duties, I do not think it too much to expect that he should use a little exertion, (recollection, perhaps I should say,) to overcome his lassitude. If he reflects for an instant on the nature of the service, he will perform it with due solemnity. I am persuaded that no serious man will regard these matters with indifference. The least things connected with the service of God are considerable, if in no other respect, as indications of disposition and feeling.”—pp. 17, 18.

The remaining topics adverted to in this charge are, first, the immense importance of Day Schools, or Sunday Schools for the instruction of the poor, on the national system; these are urgently recommended, as worthy of all the thoughts and exertion which a parochial minister can bestow on them, and as most likely to

crown his labours with an abundant reward. It is well known that the Bishop of London has been obstinately and bitterly assailed as the enemy of education. If there exist at this moment individuals ignorant or malicious enough to persevere in this brainless and heartless calumny, to the language of this Charge we would refer them, seconded as it is by the uniform and notorious tenor of his Lordship's conduct. They will there find an irresistible confutation of their slander. They will be compelled either to renounce their error, or virtually to confess that it is an error too precious to be given up!

"But then," his Lordship adds,

"while the principal attention of the Christian minister is confined to his immediate duties, he will be anxious to contribute in his proportion to the spiritual happiness of his fellow-creatures on a more extended scale. It is the nature of piety to delight in the diffusion of blessings; and Christian Churches have ever been careful to testify their zeal for the honour of God, and the good of mankind, by founding and supporting establishments for religious and charitable purposes. It is impossible to contemplate without much satisfaction the number and importance of such institutions, in close connection with our own Church, and principally maintained by the Clergy, and those of her lay members who are most decidedly attached to her principles."—p. 19.

These remarks naturally lead to the mention of several institutions, which have the first claim on the beneficent support of all who are sincerely attached to the Establishment; namely, the two sister Societies "for Promoting Christian Knowledge," and "for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts;" the "Society for the Conversion and Religious Instruction of Negro Slaves," established by Bishop Porteus; and the Institutions "for the Education and Maintenance of Orphans," and "the Relief of the Widows" of poor Clergymen. Our space forbids us to insert the arguments and statements by which his Lordship bespeaks the public patronage in behalf of these admirable designs. We do, however, most earnestly solicit the attention of the pious and the affluent to the earnest exhortations of the Bishop on this subject. There are many well disposed and excellent individuals who are fond of picturesque excursions into the wild and devious regions of charitable and religious enterprize. There are mixed up with the compassion of such persons certain elements, of which they are hardly conscious, but which by no means improve its quality. Their kindness is sometimes rendered volatile and unsteady by a capricious appetite for novelty and excitement; and thus it often happens that charitable designs are pursued by them in something of the same spirit, which keeps the children of this world perpetually flitting, and wheeling, and doubling through all the mazes of fashionable variety and dissipation. Strange as

it may appear, occupations connected with benevolence and piety may, at last, stand in the place of amusements to those whose sensibilities are fitful, and whose principles are imperfectly established. We repeat, that such persons are frequently unconscious of this unsettled habit of mind, which engages them in an endless course of experimental humanity, and drives them round the whole encyclopædia of religious charity. We therefore, once more entreat of them to consider whether their sympathies, and their resources, might not be more effectively applied within a more definite sphere. Certain charitable designs there are, whose value is unquestionable, and which present the amplest scope for the application of wealth, talent and activity. Of this nature are the institutions, of which the Bishop of London here stands forth the venerable and zealous advocate. Let us hope that he will not appeal in vain to the dutiful sons of the English Church.

We close our extracts from this admirable Charge with a portion of the concluding paragraph, which cannot fail to animate us with a sense of consolation and encouragement.

“ In the course of this Address, I have cursorily touched on a number of subjects, but I trust at sufficient length to excite the attention which their real importance deserves. It is surely essential to our reputation and usefulness, as the Clergy of a National Church, that in the discharge of our relative duties one towards another, we should act with a mutual regard to the laws of charity and of conscience; that we should join as one man in asserting our spiritual mission, and defending our pure faith, against the overbearing encroachments of usurpation and error; that we should hallow the name of our Lord in every point of our ministry, from the greatest down to the least; that we should co-operate with our Church in its designs for imparting the knowledge of salvation to all mankind; that we should be forward in every good work, more especially in relieving the indigent families of our deceased brethren. And, when I consider the spirit that prevails among the Clergy, their liberal submission to lawful authority; their ability in the defence of our Apostolical Church, and their attachment to the doctrine contained in its formularies; when I see them in the midst of their parishes, engaged in their pastoral labours, and compute the result of their exertions, in extending the means of education, and the facilities of public worship, I perceive great reason to rejoice. When, again, I behold our societies, intent on the maintenance of pure Christianity among the colonists, and the conversion of the heathen in our foreign settlements, encouraging the erection of Churches, the foundation of schools, and the endowment of colleges, on spots which, within our own recollection, were desolate wildernesses, or the habitations of barbarous tribes unacquainted with the name of Christ, and performing the work of evangelists to the ends of the earth; when I see the most enlightened men in the country applying their wealth and talents to the furtherance of these exertions, and witness the disposition of our Government to promote true Christian worship at home, and to afford to the remotest dependencies of the empire the bles-

sings of our holy religion in their fulness and purity, I feel a confidence rising within me, that, under the protection of its Supreme Head, and the guidance of his Holy Spirit, our Church will ultimately triumph over all the attacks of superstition, enthusiasm, or infidelity, however abetted by worldly ambition, or impelled by fanatical zeal, will gradually throw off the dross which is generated by human corruption in her own bosom, and shine as the luminary of the Christian world till the second coming of her founder.—pp. 24, 25.

ART. XII.—*Observations on Clerical Funds; a Letter addressed to the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Chester.* By the Rev. William Hale Hale, M.A. his Lordship's Domestic Chaplain, and Preacher at the Charter House. 8vo. pp. 24. 1s. 6d. London. Mawman. 1826.

MR. HALE commences with observing, that the Clerical Funds now in existence are applied to the relief of disabled clergymen, or of poor clergymen, or of the widows or orphans of clergymen; and he proposes a plan by which widows may be provided for from a new source. He thinks it impracticable to enforce a compulsory contribution from the clergy for this purpose, and suggests in lieu thereof, the formation of Diocesan Societies, for securing Annuities to the Widows of Clergymen. We subjoin an outline of the scheme.

All the clergy of a diocese are eligible for admission; but such as do not join the society within six months after its establishment, or within six months after their admission into the diocese, shall be excluded, except on the condition of paying up such arrears, together with interest, and compound interest, as would be due on the supposition of their having joined the society at the aforesaid time. The society is divided into seven classes, and the annual subscriptions and marriage fines payable by members, are as follows.

| Annuity to Widow. | Class. | Bachelor's Subscription Annually. | | | Fine on Marriage. | | | Married Member's Ann. Sub. | | |
|-------------------|--------|-----------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-------------------|-----------|-----------|----------------------------|-----------|-----------|
| | | <i>l.</i> | <i>s.</i> | <i>d.</i> | <i>l.</i> | <i>s.</i> | <i>d.</i> | <i>l.</i> | <i>s.</i> | <i>d.</i> |
| 100 <i>l.</i> | I. | 5 | 5 | 0 | 52 | 10 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 |
| 75 <i>l.</i> | II. | 3 | 18 | 9 | 39 | 7 | 6 | 10 | 10 | 0 |
| 50 <i>l.</i> | III. | 2 | 12 | 6 | 26 | 5 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 |
| 40 <i>l.</i> | IV. | 2 | 2 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 12 | 0 |
| 25 <i>l.</i> | V. | 1 | 6 | 3 | 13 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 10 | 0 |
| 20 <i>l.</i> | VI. | 1 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 2 | 16 | 0 |
| 10 <i>l.</i> | VII. | 0 | 10 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 0 |

If the age of the husband exceed that of the wife by more than five years, there is an additional fine for every year above that number. "No widow shall be entitled of right to an annuity, whose husband has not been a married member five years, and made six annual payments;" without which provision it would be necessary to adopt a scale of annual payments, nearly one half greater. Then follow provisos for bachelors marrying to increase the annuity, for married members to increase the annuity, and for a reduction of the marriage fine after having subscribed ten, and for its remission after having subscribed during twenty, years as a bachelor. Widowers are to subscribe as bachelors, but to pay a fresh fine upon a second marriage. Widows marrying again, are to lose their annuity during the continuance of such marriage; and *members* marrying *annuitants* are to pay the marriage fine, but subscribe as bachelors. Such is Mr. Hale's plan, and we extract the observations which accompany it.

"As to the correctness of the scale of payments, here proposed by way of example, it will be deemed, I should hope, sufficient to state, that the plan now laid before your lordship has been examined and approved by Wm. Morgan, Esq. the able and intelligent Actuary of the Equitable Insurance Office, and that the payments are in proportion nearly the same as those adopted under his express direction, by a Society established in 1820, for the benefit of Widows of Officers in the Medical Department of the Army, and which, in the formation of its plan, has availed itself of the experience of similar institutions, of many years' standing, in the Royal Artillery and Engineers. The talent and experience which have been called into action in these establishments, preclude all doubt as to their capability of meeting their engagements to bodies of persons, whose lives are exposed to dangers and casualties far more destructive than any that can possibly occur to the clergy.

"How far, my lord, the plan here proposed, of which the most striking and also the most valuable feature is, the securing the co-operation of persons* not yet married, may meet the wishes of the Clergy, can only, before experiment made, be judged of by what has happened in similar cases. but we may fairly expect that, in the adoption of the proposed plan by the Clergy of the Church of England, feelings will be displayed as honourable and as remarkable as those which have distinguished the Clergy of Scotland, and the married and unmarried officers in those departments of the army which have been mentioned. In the year 1743, when the Widows' Fund was established in Scotland, which prospectively made it compulsory upon the beneficed Clergy of Scotland to subscribe to the Fund, only 146 ministers out of 997 declined to enrol themselves amongst its members. The pensions originally insured to the

* Mr. Morgan has stated that, in order to secure the stability of the fund, one-fourth of the members should be unmarried. How far this proportion will suit the condition of the clergy, has not yet been ascertained. Should it be found to vary considerably, a different scale of payment must be adopted.

widows, varied, at the option of the minister subscribing, from 10*l.* to 15*l.*, 20*l.*, and 25*l.*; and the fact which I am now about to state, I bring forward, to show with what readiness men avail themselves of the advantages offered by these funds, to the utmost of their means. By the Report made to the general assembly, in 1824, it appeared, that of 332 Annuitants, only 6 were widows whose husbands had subscribed for the lowest pension in the scale, 10*l.*; and only 54 for the second pension, 15*l.*; whilst 134 persons had subscribed for 20*l.* pension, and 137 for the highest pension, 25*l.* These are facts drawn from the Report of a Fund, to which the contribution is compulsory, the degree of it alone being optional. An equally encouraging result is shown in the Report of the Voluntary Association for securing Pensions to the Widows of Officers in the Medical Department of the Army. The whole number of subscribers in March last, was 629; of these, 75 were married members, subscribing to receive 20*l.* pension for their widows; whilst those who subscribed for the larger sum, 40*l.*, amounted to 184. Of members still unmarried, who had enrolled themselves in the class to receive the lowest pension, the number was 154, whilst that of the highest class was 216.

“The Royal Artillery Marriage Society is an association perfectly voluntary amongst the officers of that corps; yet the number of subscribers amounted, in January 1826, to 605; and of these, 273 only were married, the remaining 332 being either bachelors or widowers.”
—pp. 19—21.

With sentiments of the highest respect for the Prelate under whose sanction this measure is brought forward, and with sincere gratitude to the ingenious and excellent person, who has arranged and developed its details, we are compelled to express grave doubts respecting the possibility of carrying it into effect. Upon the great want of some better provision for the widows of clergymen, two opinions cannot exist; and we do not presume to say that we are prepared with a better, or even with as good a scheme as Mr. Hale's. But his plan appears to us to be open to the following objections:—

As no widow is entitled to an annuity unless her husband has made six annual payments, and been a married member five years; a clergyman must either insure his life for those five years, or run the risk of leaving his widow destitute in spite of his subscription to the Diocesan Society. And this risk must be considerable; for Mr. Morgan computes that it could not be guarded against “without adopting a scale of annual payments, nearly one half greater.” Now if a clergyman must first subscribe as a bachelor, secondly pay a marriage fine, and thirdly, insure his life for the first five or six years of his marriage, ought he to prefer Mr. Hale's system, to a common life-insurance, which may purchase an annuity for his widow, or

provide for the education of his children, as he may please to direct?

“But the most striking and most valuable feature of the plan is, securing the co-operation of persons not yet married.” And in the Military Societies this feature undoubtedly produces a great effect; because, in both of the cases quoted by Mr. Hale, considerably more than half the subscribers are bachelors, and the proportion is not likely to vary. But the proportion of unmarried clergymen has not yet been ascertained; if it is less than a fourth, a higher scale of payment must be adopted, and we suspect that even an eighth would be above the truth.

We suspect also that Mr. Hale will not find the same facility in procuring subscriptions as has been experienced in the excellent and well conducted societies to which he refers. The medical officers of the army, and the officers of the artillery are small and compact bodies; they are in constant communication with the head quarters of their respective corps; their pay, we presume, is usually remitted through agents; and the subscriptions paid to the fund are merely deductions from their allowances. There is also throughout the service an universal disposition to befriend the *poor married* officer. His uncomfortable circumstances are placed in a strong light before the eyes of kind-hearted bachelors, who, while they continue bachelors, have generally money to spare, and will gladly contribute to make provision for the widow of a messmate, whom they know to be incapable of doing so himself. The unmarried clergy are neither so well acquainted with the situation of a married brother, nor so able to assist him when in distress. In fact, a large proportion of the few who continue unmarried are either under the influence of ruthless poverty, or are scraping up a purse to pay their *marriage fines*.

We have ventured to throw out these suggestions, but certainly not with the intention of discouraging Mr. Hale's attempt. We shall sincerely rejoice at hearing our objections answered; and at finding our apprehensions groundless. The more a plan of this kind is considered and debated before it is brought into action, the greater is its ultimate chance of success; and the remarks which we have made, will not prove wholly worthless, if they call the attention of Mr. Hale and his friends to points, upon which further explanation will be thankfully received.

ART. XIII.—1. *The Tendency of Prevalent Opinions about Knowledge, considered. A Sermon, preached before the University of Cambridge, on Commencement Sunday, July 2d, 1826. By the Rev. Hugh James Rose, M. A., of Trinity College, and Vicar of Horsham, Sussex. Cambridge: Deighton and Sons; and C. and J. Rivington, London. 2s. 1826.*

2. *Prospectus of the London University.*

THE truth of the common maxim "*corruptio optimi pessima*," with others of a similar kind, depends mainly on the principle; that in the moral as well as in the natural world, the action of any force may be equally exerted in opposite directions. Thus the enlargement of man's intellectual dominion is in itself a great and indisputable good: but such is the condition of humanity, that this power, like every thing else, which we possess, is obviously capable of being perverted to the worst purposes; and the quantity of the evil must be in exact proportion to the magnitude of the power, which is generated and set in motion. While, therefore, we entirely agree with the proposition, which declares, in the language of the Scriptures, "*The wise man is strong*," and again, "*Wisdom strengtheneth the wise, more than ten mighty men, that are in the city*;" or which says in the words of Bacon, "*Knowledge is power*;" we think it evident at the same time, that the question as to the *kind* of knowledge which is attained, the objects for which it is sought, and the uses to which it is applied, must acquire a more awful and paramount importance in a direct ratio to its own extent, and the number of its recipients. In the same degree, and for the same reason, as the aberrations of genius are more dangerous than the mistakes of imbecility, as the sarcasm of a Gibbon, or the sophistry of a Voltaire, carry more mischief about them, than the ravings of a Taylor, or the absurdities of a Carlyle: the misdirection of knowledge, generally, is fraught with infinitely more peril to a state, than the errors and prejudices of inactive ignorance.

It seems also clear to us, that they, who have most at heart the moral and intellectual advancement of mankind, are precisely the persons, who will watch with the keenest scrutiny, with the most intense solicitude, with apprehensions springing even from their hopes, the prevalent schemes and notions, by which interests so mighty can be affected; and who will be most anxious to attest the sincerity of their zeal, by their attempts to supply deficiencies, to correct abuses, and to prevent the stream from either flowing into a wrong channel, or being prematurely and irreparably lost amid the sands and morasses of idle and unprofitable inquiry;

while they also perceive that the fertility or the destruction accompanying its course, must be a result measured by the volume of the water, and depending on the direction which it takes.

It is with these feelings, and under these impressions, that we proceed to an examination of the most influential opinions on the subject of knowledge, and the most remarkable systems of instruction, at a time, when it is allowed on all hands, that a spirit of intellectual activity exists among us, stronger and more widely extended, than has been exhibited by any other country, or at any former period in our own: and we have rather chosen to introduce our strictures by what we readily allow to be a string of truisms, than to have it supposed for a moment, that we are hostile to the progress of real science; or have any wish whatever to impede the utmost exertions of the human mind, and the fullest development of all its faculties.

We have already stated, that the intellectual activity of the age is universally admitted. This, however, is almost the only point on which the contending parties are agreed: for while the many regard the energy of this spirit, as an unmingled blessing; there are still some, who consider it as a dazzling, but fallacious, advantage, which will ultimately prove a nuisance and a curse to the community. The projectors of the day describe the kind of knowledge, which has lately become fashionable, as the best and most useful which it is possible to administer; yet, there are men who rate it at a far lower estimate, and assert that it has been pursued at the expense of other branches of learning, incomparably superior in intrinsic dignity, and more beneficial in their actual results.

Among the persons of the latter description, may be reckoned Mr. Rose, whose sermons we have prefixed to this article. The topic, which he has chosen, is "the tendency of the prevalent opinions about knowledge;" and his great object is to refute the apostles of practical education and scientific attainments. For this purpose he undertakes to show, that the knowledge in vogue among the projectors and system mongers of the day, is "base mechanical;" that "there is no legitimate object of knowledge, but the improvement of our intellectual and moral being with reference to its ultimate destiny," "nor any other standard of value for knowledge, than the degree in which it promotes that improvement:"—but that at present, "a false view of the objects of knowledge has been taken, namely, immediate utility and present reward, and a false and debasing standard of value erected, namely, public opinion." He appears infinitely to prefer literature to science, and to think the sciences themselves deserving of study and admiration, in proportion as they are pure, speculative, and abstract. Experi-

mental philosophy seems, in his eyes, a sorry substitute and exchange for deep and accurate scholarship; and he considers the direct advantages which can result from any intellectual pursuit, as nothing, in comparison with its reflective efficacy in developing the faculties and purifying the heart.

Our object, however, in the present article, is not so much to canvass the merits of Mr. Rose's sermon, as to examine the state of the dispute between him and his opponents; to ascertain how far he is borne out by facts, and afterwards to introduce some remarks upon certain institutions to which his strictures peculiarly apply, and which appear to deserve a more careful consideration than they have hitherto received.

As to the *facts*, then, we cannot go the whole length with this nervous and uncompromising writer, when he asserts, that "the country, which once, within a few years, produced and gloried in a More, a Norris, a Cudworth, and a Stillingfleet, must blush to confess, that she can hardly name among all her sons, more than a single metaphysical or ethical student; that scholarship of the higher class possesses only a bare and dubious existence; that *pure* literature shares the same neglect; and that every department of intellectual research, which requires time, and thought, and patience, without offering a prospect of immediate advantage, is rejected with a vehemence of anger, and branded as visionary." On the contrary, we are happy in believing, that there are yet among us many sound and excellent divines, many "ripe and good" scholars; many contemplative and profound students, by whom "knowledge is valued for its own sake, and not only for its direct and practical utility." But, that Mr. Rose is right to a considerable extent, is a truth, of which we are more and more confirmed, by the experience of every hour. It is impossible to deny, as long as we speak *in generals*, that the grand object of pursuit is the knowledge of the material universe, as tending, most directly, to add to the conveniences and comforts of life, and to bestow immediate reward on those whose sagacity leads them to discovery themselves, or to profit by the discoveries of others. The prevalent bias of the times, unquestionably, leads towards mechanical and astronomical science. We may trace this tendency in the almost innumerable multitude of patents which have been granted for inventions or improvements in machinery, or for processes connected with the useful arts; in the variety of companies, which two or three years ago burst into existence, for insurance—for mining—for rail-roads—for canals—for the supply of factitious wants, which, in the days of our more homely forefathers, were unfelt and unimagined: in the discourse and habits

of society; in the tone of literature, and more especially in the topics discussed by the Journals, the Reviews, the Magazines, and all other periodical publications, of which it is the common province to reflect, as in a mirror, the manners and feelings of the people. If we look either at the aggregate number of books published, by a reference to the annual, or quarterly, or monthly catalogues; or at the degree of popularity, which is acquired by any single production, we shall find, that the largest proportion of works, and the widest sphere of circulation, must be ascribed to subjects, which are either calculated to afford mere amusement, or have an immediate bearing upon the use and accommodation of animal life. We can hardly give a publication a worse name, as is well known to Mr. Coleridge, and many other writers of very considerable powers, than by calling it *metaphysical*, or by hinting that *metaphysics* are mixed up with its ostensible matter: the case is little better with respect to ethical and logical disquisitions: a volume of poetry is about the most hazardous of literary speculations; and the question of "*cui bono?*" is not unfrequently asked with a shrug and a sneer: while, on the other hand, a treatise on chemistry is bought and read with comparative avidity; for the crudest lucubrations of the political economists, there is, to borrow one of their own phrases, "a steady demand in the market;" and fortunes have been made by a few hundred pages, upon the sublime and momentous topic of domestic cookery.

These effects have arisen from the joint operation of several existing causes; but the principal of them are, First, the natural spirit of a country, distinguished throughout the world for its commerce, its manufactures, its practical enterprise and skill. Second; the increase of luxury and artificial desires, consequent upon the accumulation of wealth. Third; the inherent distinction between the moral and mechanical sciences, inasmuch as the advantages of the one class are palpable at once, and obvious to all mankind, while the benefits of the other are less visible and obtrusive, in the same ratio as they are, in reality, greater and more lasting. Fourth; the accidental splendour thrown around the former department of knowledge, and the new stimulus given to its pursuit by the late magnificent discoveries, the results of which are daily and deservedly regarded with mingled admiration and astonishment. A Fifth, and more remote cause, may perhaps be added, in our reverence for the philosophy of Bacon, of which the character is so eminently inductive and experimental, and of which the chief aim seems, or at least is generally supposed to be, as its founder himself expresses it, "the enlargement of man's dominion over nature." Partial and mistaken views of his

system have very probably been formed : but still the actual consequence has been to ensure a paramount superiority to objective and physical, over metaphysical and subjective studies.

Having thus attempted a general and preliminary sketch of the signs and temper of the times, with reference to knowledge, we shall now hasten to a closer examination of the facts, as they regard *modern systems of popular instruction*.

In speaking of Elementary Schools, the remark, however trite, can scarcely too often be repeated, that reading and writing are the *instruments* and not the *substance* of knowledge, or proper education. It is not enough to furnish boys—and of course *girls* might be included, but that we have no room to treat of female instruction—with the capacity of acquiring information, without duly initiating them into those kinds of learning, which ought most to be acquired. Now, as far as National Schools are concerned, strict attention is undoubtedly paid to the inculcation of virtuous and religious principles : but when we consider in our minds the whole population of the British Empire, and then apply to it the scheme and extent of existing education, we perceive, or fancy that we perceive, a lamentable chasm or deficiency in the case of the children of those persons—as for example, petty shop-keepers or very small farmers—who are *above* sending them to a Charity School, and have not the means of sending them to a Classical, or even what is called a Commercial Academy. We moreover apprehend, that no adequate preparatory instruction has yet been provided for thousands of a somewhat lower class, who are likely afterwards to enrol themselves as members of a Mechanics' Institute or some other similar establishment appropriated to adults.

The conception of Mechanics' Institutes, to whomsoever it may originally belong, appears enlightened as well as philanthropic. We mean simply the project of teaching, in a cheap and easy method, the application of science to arts and trades, and the theoretical principles, on which practice must ultimately rest, and by which it ought uniformly to be guided. There is something extremely fit to dazzle and engage the mind in thus turning artizans into philosophers, and handicraftsmen into studious inquirers. When we see the means unfolded and brought into play, by which knowledge, the most immediately useful, is thrown into the very grasp of persons who had never before even aspired to its attainment : when we perceive workmen of various descriptions enabled to *instruct themselves* without dependence on the higher classes ; and in establishments placed under their own management and direction, become, as husbands and fathers, more capable of supporting their wives and families, and, as

citizens, more valuable and serviceable to the state, besides securing an innocent and profitable occupation for their leisure hours, we cannot but discern an engine of a two-fold benefit, both from the good which it does, and the vice and idleness which it may prevent.

This is the bright side of the picture. There is of course a dark one too. Few things can be conceived, which require a sounder judgment and a more enlarged experience than the task of founding such institutions upon the proper basis, of confining them within the due limits, and guarding them from corruption and abuse by wise and stable regulations. The best intentions will only produce harm without the most consummate prudence and skill, and it is hard to say, whether the greatest difficulty consists in fixing with exact nicety the scale on which such establishments should be formed, and the views and spirit with which they should be conducted; or in accurately adjusting the lectures and other modes of tuition to the wants and situations of the learners. Associations of this kind may be so constructed as to beget among the members the most mischievous ideas of grandeur and self-importance; and information may be so bestowed, as to cause evils, both moral and intellectual, of which neither the limits nor the consequences can be foreseen. Attempts may, and perhaps ought to be made, not merely to gratify the thirst for scientific instruction upon matters of immediate concern to the mechanics, but to excite in their breasts a modest desire for further improvement, by opening to them by degrees some glimpses of other knowledge, sublimer in its character, and more elevated in its object;—but these advantages can never be obtained without the risk of flying above the level of their capacity, and their previous acquirements; and of inflating their minds by confused and undigested notions upon many departments of intellectual research, with which under their circumstances a thorough acquaintance is impossible. Practice, built upon long habit and observation, may thus be far preferable to crude and imperfect science: and, without constant vigilance, feelings may be engendered among the workmen, evincing not so much the honourable desire of bettering their condition by patient industry, as a hankering discontent—an overweening pride and self-conceit with regard to their intrinsic value and attainments, and a mingled envy and contempt of the masters by whom they are employed, and, in general, of their superiors in external rank, or influence, or wealth.

Whether the dangers and difficulties, here mentioned, have been altogether surmounted in the establishments, which are already in actual operation, we shall be better able to form an

opinion, by looking for a moment at the rise and progress of the Mechanics' Institute in the Metropolis.

The one thing, desirable beyond every other in such an Institution, appears to be, that all should be managed in the most simple, quiet, and unpretending manner; and the one thing most to be avoided, that it should be made a hobby and show-room for the patrons, instead of being wholly a place of profitable study for the artizans. There can never be any need of giving a studied dignity and importance to these establishments; for their natural and inevitable tendency is to exalt the notions of the mechanics quite enough without adventitious aid. Yet we think, that in London—to say nothing of other towns—there has been a vast deal of superfluous ostentation and parade. The real interests of the mechanics have in a certain degree been sacrificed to the glory of heading a procession, and the opportunity of making a speech. When the building for the Institute was begun, and again when it was finished, Dr. Birkbeck took occasion to utter a florid and declamatory harangue about “opening the Temple of Knowledge,” and “accelerating the march of the mind,” with other flowers of rhetoric, of which the beauty and freshness have been somewhat tarnished by the lips through which they have occasionally passed. Mr. Brougham next mounted the rostrum *with the kind permission of the assembly*; and completely identifying himself with its members—among whom he has by the way been enrolled—pronounced a long discourse for the edification of his *fellow-mechanics*, and talked of “*our*” worthy president, “*our*” duties, “*our*” energies, “*our*” resources, and “*our*” prospects. What could be his motive, we shall not endeavour to divine; but does he suppose, that, by this idle and spurious condescension, the workmen will imagine Mr. Brougham to be either reducing, or meaning to reduce, himself to an equality with *their* station? or will they not rather think, that *they* are raised, or intended to be raised, almost to the level of persons who move in the same sphere of life with Mr. Brougham? At the same, or a similar, meeting, Dr. Birkbeck expatiated on the dignity of human nature, and spoke with horror of “*immortal man counterpoising a coal-basket!*” Now, in the name of human improvement, and in furtherance of the dignity of human nature, let science be advanced as far and as fast as may be possible:—but in the mean time, let not the lower classes be disgusted with their toilsome, yet necessary employments. Such language ought at least to be reserved for that golden age, when the progress of knowledge shall have superseded all the humbler kinds of manual or corporeal exertion. For our own parts, we apprehend that this consummation will not be realized, until a complete change

shall have been effected both in the human frame, and in the material universe. At present, it seems almost as sensible to complain of "immortal man" eating, or "immortal man" drinking, or "immortal man" performing the other more degrading offices connected with our physical infirmities and wants. What, too, shall we say of "immortal man" blacking shoes, or cleaning knives and forks, or sweeping the streets, or breaking the stones for the roads under the auspices of Mr. Mac Adam? As long as these things must be done at all, it is surely better that they should be done with a cheerful spirit. We might pursue the subject; but we feel convinced that Dr. Birkbeck,—whom we readily believe to be a man of learning and of excellent intentions, although he may be somewhat too fond of playing the first part in an establishment, which has conferred upon him a notoriety that might not otherwise have fallen to his lot,—will see the propriety of refraining from such expressions at a period, when—whatever may be the case hereafter—there are still gradations in society, and *some* persons must be at the bottom of the scale. There would be infinitely more wisdom in telling the mechanics, that it is not *immortal* man, who counterpoises the coal-basket, but mortal man in his state of trial and probation, before he has put on his immortality; and that, in this, the truest and most philosophical view of human concerns, there is nothing, which can really be degrading, except idleness, or immorality, or that distempered fretfulness, which destroys the individual's own peace of mind, while it is apt to disturb the community of which he is a part.

Mr. Brougham remarks in his "Practical Observations addressed to the Working Classes and their Employers," that "much depends upon a right course being taken at first; proper rules laid down; fit subjects selected for Lectures; good teachers chosen; and that upon all these matters the opinions and wishes of those, who chiefly contribute to found the several institutions, must receive great attention." Yet, if we had any quarrel with the Founder and President of the Mechanics' Institute in London, we might hint, that the "subjects selected for Lectures," even by himself—as for example, "*The Theory of the Winds*,"—have not always been the most appropriate and serviceable in the world; nor the tone of sentiment and style precisely suited to the comprehension of his hearers, or the few opportunities which they can have found for the cultivation of their understandings in early life.

Again, if these Establishments are to be placed, as we generally find them, under the control of the Artizans, some provision ought, we think, to be made, and some guarantee to be afforded, that they will uniformly be devoted to their primary and ostensible

purpose of giving and receiving Lectures, and not turned into any thing which bears, or even resembles, the shape of a British Forum, a Debating Society, or a Spouting Club. If ever this should be the case, the spirit of illegal combination will most probably be fostered, and the whole utility of the Institutions will evaporate in frothy disputes. Mr. Brougham, who appears from many passages in his Pamphlet, to be a most strenuous stickler for the principle, that the management and direction of their Institutes should be left either principally, or entirely, in the hands of the Mechanics, has added in one place, "We have never found any inconvenience from this plan during the twelve months that our Institution in London has been established. In Glasgow, there is a much longer experience in its favour; with this addition, that a contrary plan having at one time been pursued there, *the men ceased to interest themselves in the Lecture, and the Institution declined.*" Mr. Brougham may view the fact thus related, with complacency and satisfaction, as corroborating the system which he recommends: but to us it is rather a demonstration, that these establishments have always a tendency towards becoming mere haranguing societies for the journeymen of commercial and manufacturing towns; and that, without the utmost care, the seeds of abuse and decay will be soon mingled with their constitution. Let not our remark be misinterpreted: we make it, because we sincerely wish them well. We here see—and we regret to see—a proof, that, with some at least of the workmen, the desire of knowledge may be subordinate to the pride of conducting an establishment of their own, to the love of having an Evening Assembly, and hearing themselves talk. But a far stronger instance may be adduced in the meeting, which was previously described in hand-bills, as likely to be of the utmost interest and importance to the Mechanics, and which was very lately convened in the *theatre*—as it is magniloquently and somewhat absurdly called—of the Institute in London: where a large number of persons were congregated for no other apparent purpose, except perhaps the pleasure of debate, than to pass a resolution for supporting the *Trades' Newspaper*, because it advocated the cause of the working classes, and to discuss the propriety of a scheme, which was very seriously proposed, of forming themselves into Associations upon the plan suggested, and in part reduced to practice, by Mr. Owen, of New Lanark and of Harmony!

The mention, in connection with Mechanics' Institutes, of an enthusiast, who, however philanthropic, is so decidedly at war with the political and ecclesiastical regulations, not only of England, but of every civilized country, which exists, or has existed, leads us to that part of our subject, about which we feel the most

immediate concern,—namely, the quantity of moral and religious instruction which is provided at these, or similar, establishments.

Here, in order to furnish our readers with the most accurate and unimpeachable *data* for the regulation of their opinions, we shall copy an official advertisement, extracted from the Examiner of November the 12th, 1826, and inserted by the committee of the London Mechanics' Institution.

“The public are respectfully informed, that an annual payment of twenty shillings will confer the following important advantages:—

“1. Admission to the lectures, Wednesdays and Fridays in each week.

“2. To the Reading-Room, open daily, from ten in the morning till ten in the evening, and to the use of the Library of Circulation, containing upwards of 2,500 volumes.

“3. To the Elementary Schools for instructions in *Arithmetic, Mathematics, Drawing, French, Geography, and Writing.*”

We thus easily discern of what kind is the education provided for the mechanics. It is very plain, that neither morality nor religion is included in the course. The lectures, again, are appropriated to chemistry, mechanics, the pure and mixed mathematics, and some branches of natural philosophy. But in addition to the lectures and the “School of Arts,” we find, also, that extensive libraries have been formed. Of what books are they composed? Let us hear Mr. Brougham. In one place he says, “the books are of all kinds, with the exception of *theology*, which, from the various sects the men belong to, is of necessity excluded.” In another passage, he makes the same assertion in substance, both with regard to circulating libraries, and also to reading societies and book clubs. In some institutions, too, “original papers upon subjects of science and literature are read at the quarterly meetings, no topics being excluded from discussion except those of a polemical and party nature.” In others, “the men meet every evening, to *converse* upon literary and scientific subjects, and once a week to lecture; any one who chooses, giving a fortnight's notice that he will treat on some subject, which he has been studying.” “At these meetings for discussion, papers are read and conversations entertained upon any scientific or literary subject, with two exceptions only, controversial divinity and party politics.” Thus, we see, that religion is pretty well put *hors de combat*: might we not say, that it is absolutely scouted? The mechanics may neither read about it, nor write about it, nor talk about it. They are not only *not* encouraged, but they are strictly forbidden. For the absence of religion, Mr. Brougham expresses no regret; but with politics, as we shall very soon have an opportunity of perceiving, he is by no means disposed to part so easily.

Another engine of popular education is the publication of cheap works: these have sometimes been produced entire and at once, but more frequently they have been published by degrees in parts, or numbers; the latter method being better "suited to the circumstances of the classes, whose income is derived from wages." The distress which has lately occurred in the book-selling, as well as in most other trades, has, for the present, inflicted a terrible check upon this system of instruction; but we may refer to Mr. Brougham for information as to what it was when in active operation, and, therefore, as to what it will probably be again, whenever it shall be resuscitated into its former vigour. He tells us—

"The circulation of cheap works of a merely amusing kind, as well as of those connected with the arts, is at present (in 1824-5,) very great in England; *those of an aspect somewhat more forbidding, though at once moral, interesting, and most useful, is very limited*; while in Scotland there is a considerable demand for them."

And again—

"In looking over the list of those cheap publications, which are unconnected with the arts, we certainly do not find many that are of a very instructive cast; and here it is that something may be done by way of encouragement."

Soon after he goes on to say—

"Lord John Russell, in his excellent and instructive speech upon parliamentary reform, delivered in 1822, stated, that an 'establishment was commenced a few years ago, by a number of individuals, with a capital of not less than a million, for the purpose of printing standard works at a cheap rate;' and he added, that it had been 'very much checked in its operation by one of those acts for the suppression of knowledge, which were passed in the year 1819, although one of its rules was not to allow the vendors of its works to sell any book on the political controversies of the day.' The only part of this plan which appears at all objectionable, is the *restriction upon politics*. Why should not political, as well as all other works, be published in a cheap form and in numbers. To allow, or rather to induce the people to take part in discussions upon political economy is not merely safe, but most wholesome for the community, and yet some points connected with them are matter of pretty warm contention in the present times; but these may be freely handled, it seems, with safety; indeed, unless they are so handled, such subjects cannot be discussed at all. Why then may not *every topic of politics, party as well as general*, be treated of in cheap publications? It is highly useful to the community that the true principles of the constitution, ecclesiastical and civil, should be well understood by every man, who lives under it. The great interests of civil and religious liberty are mightily promoted by such wholesome instruction; but the good order of society gains to the full as much by it. The peace of the country, and the sta-

bility of the government, could not be more effectually secured than by the universal diffusion of this kind of knowledge. The abuses, which through time have crept into the practice of the constitution, the errors committed in its administration, and the improvements, which a change of circumstances require, even in its principles, may most fitly be expounded in the same manner."

Now, we have no objection to the doctrine here inculcated by Mr. Brougham. We think, that in a free country it is manifestly impossible, whether it be desirable or not, that the working mechanics, or the lower classes in general, should be prevented from reading about politics, or from disputing upon political subjects. The newspaper comes with the Sunday morning; they *can* read it, and they *will* read it. In fact, the whole reading of our English artizans may, for the most part, fairly be summed up in the "Mechanics' Magazine," and the "Mechanics' Register," some cheap publications of a lighter cast, such as "The Mirror," and the weekly journals. But we venture to ask Mr. Brougham, if he is so anxious to admit politics, with what consistency can he exclude religion? With what reason will he open the door wide for the one, and shut it in the face of the other with something like disdain? Are the points of disagreement so much more numerous, or the controversies and contentions likely to be so much more frequent and violent in religion than in politics? Does it not seem absurd, that a man should be prohibited from reading a religious treatise in his club room, because there happens to be another man in the same room who is of a different sect? Why, in short, should theology alone be kept out by a positive regulation, when works upon every other topic of human inquiry are liable to admission or rejection according to the votes of the members in any of these establishments for the instruction of our mechanics?

Such, however, is the case with respect to adults among the working classes of our population: we shall now ascend in the scale of society, and examine how far and by what measures the same system is continued.

Here we would willingly say something of the various literary and scientific institutions which have been formed in the metropolis and elsewhere for the benefit of the middle orders, as for instance, clerks and other persons who are employed during the day in offices or counting-houses, and who are desirous of devoting some part of the evening to the improvement of their minds. It would be worth while to make a short investigation as to the kind of lectures which are given, and the description of books which furnish the libraries with their contents. The inquiry, too, might have a double degree of interest, as these institutions are intended for the instruction of both sexes. But if

we once began with concerns so numerous, and so generally extended through the kingdom, we might find it very difficult to stop; and our present object will be more speedily and completely attained by hastening forward to the last and most striking project connected with education, namely, the proposed establishment of a new University in London.

The idea, however, of a new University is far from original. There is an old treatise extant, entitled "*The Third Universitie of England:*" and a few years ago, when it was suggested, that an university might be founded at York, Lord Fitzwilliam offered, as it is said, to subscribe the magnificent sum of £50,000 for that express purpose. In London itself, too, a similar plan has been started more than once, yet it is curious to observe, that the earlier propositions of this nature were chiefly sarcastic and ironical, and seem intended to show that London is a place, where the sciences of folly and debauchery are most likely to be taught.

We re-quote the following lines, from a contemporary publication. They are in an old play by Thomas Randolph, entitled "*The Muses' Looking Glass.*"

" Oh ! I have thought on't—I will straightway build
A free-school here in London—a free-school
For th' education of young gentlemen ;
To study how to drink, and take tobacco,
To swear, to roar, to dice, to drab, to quarrel.
'Twill be the great gymnasium of the realm ;
The frontisterium of Great Brittainy !"

In the same spirit there is an amusing paper, written by the Earl of Cork, in the *Connoisseur* (No. 17.) proving the city of London to be an university, and the arts and sciences taught there in greater perfection than at Oxford or Cambridge. It begins thus—

" Though many historians have described the city of London (in which we may include Westminster) with great accuracy, yet they have not set it out in the full light, which at present it deserves:—they have not distinguished it *as a university*. Paris is a university, Dublin is a university, even Moscow is a university. But London has not been honoured with that title. I will allow our metropolis to have been originally intended only as a city of trade ; and I will farther own, that scarce any sciences, except such as are purely mercantile, were cultivated in it, till within these last thirty years. But from that period of time, I may say a whole army, as it were, of arts and sciences, have amicably marched in upon us, and have fixed themselves as auxiliaries to our capital. The four greater faculties, theology, law, medicine, and philosophy, which are taught in other universities, are in their highest perfection here."

Exemplifications are then made with much mock gravity in the cases of "logic," "eloquence," "music," "ethics, or moral philosophy," "experimental philosophy," and "hydraulics," all intended to expose the vices, the contentions, and the drunkenness of the inhabitants of the capital in those days.

But it is time to proceed in sober seriousness to the establishment which is now in progress. We shall, perhaps, better understand its nature by casting a retrospective glance at the similar projects which have preceded, and, unless we are very much mistaken, helped to produce it. The chief of these is undoubtedly the Chrestomathia of Mr. Bentham, "being the Design of an Institution proposed to be set on foot under the name of the Chrestomathic Day School, or Chrestomathic School for the Extension of the new System of Instruction to the Higher Branches of Learning, for the use of the Middling and Higher Ranks of Life," with a second part, "containing a new Nomenclature and Classification of the Sciences, grounded on the Application of the Logical Principle of exhausted bifurcate Analysis to the Moral Principle of general Utility." In many respects relating both to the form and the spirit, the Chrestomathic Day School of Mr. Bentham is the exact prototype and counterpart of the London University of Messrs. Brougham and Campbell. The plan of the former is divided into five stages, and comprehends a very extensive list of sciences. They belong principally, however, to mechanics, chemistry, or natural philosophy; and there are some very remarkable omissions, with regard to which the model, as we shall presently discover, has been since copied with very tolerable fidelity. Thus "private ethics or morals (controverted points)" can find no place in any of the stages on the ensuing grounds, "time of life too early," and "admittance pregnant with exclusion." Divinity, for the same reasons, is excluded in the lump. But then we have large amends in the introduction of other branches of learning altogether new. A single specimen of what is added may surely teach us no longer to regret what has been thrown away. In the fourth stage, there occurs the novel and sublime science dignified by the winning and felicitous title of Phthisozoics, and explained as "*the art of destruction applied to noxious animals.*" On this memorable occasion Mr. Bentham has the subjoined note.

"(Phthisozoics.) From two Greek words; one of which signifies to *destroy*; the other an *animal*:—the art of destroying such of the inferior animals, as, in the character of natural *enemies*, threaten destruction or damage,—to himself, or to such animals, from which, in the character of natural *servants* or *allies*, it is in man's power to extract useful service,—is an art, not much less necessary than that of preserving, and restor-

ing to health, those his natural *friends*.—Animals which, either immediately or mediately, as above, are regarded as noxious to man, are commonly included under the general appellation of vermin. The Complete Vermin-Killer is the title of an old established book.”—*Chrestomathia*, vol. i. p. 50.

Hence, it would really appear, that to become a “*complete vermin-killer*,” a destroyer of rats and bugs, is deemed a more valuable acquisition for a youth, than to be a proficient in moral and religious knowledge. This is no burlesque—no caricature—no exaggeration of Mr. Bentham’s *foible*: it is a quotation, extracted fairly and literally from his own book. We could laugh, we could not help laughing, but that our disposition to ridicule must be lost in unmixed sorrow, if such is the spirit of modern instruction, and such are the illuminati of the day.

Next to Mr. Bentham comes his friend and disciple Mr. Mill, who, be it remarked, is also upon the list of the council of the New London University. In the article “*Education*,” which is inserted in the Supplement to the Encyclopædia Britannica, after lavishing his praises upon the Chrestomathic scheme, and speaking in disparagement of older systems, this gentleman proceeds to observe:—

“The celebrated German philosopher, Wolf, remarks the aversion of the universities to all improvement, as a notorious thing, founded upon adequate motives, in the following terms—‘Non adeo impune turbare licet scholarum quietem, et docentibus lucrosam, et discentibus jucundam.’ *Wolfii Log. Dedic.* p. 2.

“But though such and so great are the evil tendencies, which are to be guarded against in associated seminaries of education; evil tendencies, which are apt to be indefinitely increased, when they are *united with an ecclesiastical establishment*, because whatever the vices of the ecclesiastical system, the universities have in that case an interest to bend the whole force of their education to the support of them all, and the human mind can only be rendered the friend of abuses, in proportion as it is vitiated, intellectually or morally, or both; it must, notwithstanding, be confessed, that there are great advantages in putting it in the power of youth to obtain all the branches of their education in one place; even in assembling a certain number of them together, when the principle of emulation acts with powerful effect; and the carrying on the complicated process according to a regular plan, under a certain degree of discipline, and with the powerful spur of publicity. All this ought not to be rashly sacrificed; nor does there appear to be any insuperable difficulty in devising a plan for the attainment of all these advantages, without the evils which have more or less adhered to all the collegiate establishments which Europe has yet enjoyed.”

In succeeding years the rage for new plans and establishments of education increased with an accelerated ratio. In lectures, in

pamphlets, in letters addressed to the editors of different journals, projects were proposed for building a grand place of comprehensive instruction in London. The following advertisement appeared in the Morning Chronicle, Friday, Jan. 21st, 1825.

“ At a meeting of gentlemen, held on Wednesday, the 19th instant, the plan of an institution for providing schools for the instruction of youth upon economical terms, and after the plan of the most approved public seminaries, so as to enable the middle class of society in London and its vicinity, to give their sons a liberal education, was considered, and adopted, resolutions entered into for the purpose of forming a society for carrying it into effect, under the title of ‘ The London Academical Institution.’ The plans of the direction and management of this institution are under consideration, and will be laid before the public in a few days.”

Mr. Brougham, too, writes, in speaking of the higher classes—

“ The present public seminaries must be enlarged ; and *some of the greater cities of the kingdom, especially the metropolis, must not be left destitute of the regular means within themselves of scientific education.*”

Shortly afterwards, Mr. Campbell wrote his letter to the Times, suggesting a London College or University ; and the truth appears to be, that the scheme occurred, about the same time, to Messrs. Brougham and Campbell and their friends, to found a London University or College, and to some Unitarian and other Dissenters, to found a London Academic Institution ; much in the same way, to compare small things with great, as the discovery of the fluxionary calculus, brought to their profound minds by the progress of mathematical science, was made almost simultaneously by Newton and by Leibnitz. The consequence was, that the two parties met, and the two projects were combined ; but it is very doubtful whether the interests of true knowledge will be benefited by the coalition.

We have thus traced the establishment through its several stages and gradations, until it has assumed the full honours of its present name. A day-school, an academic institution, a college, an university—all these it has already been in turn ; and it is impossible to affirm which, if any of them, it is destined to remain. Our historical statement, however slight, may be of use, as it affords the real key to the anomalies and defects, which are but too apparent in the frame and ground-work of the institution.

The first and by far the most lamentable of these, is the deficiency already so often remarked, the total omission of religion, or, if the names sound better in the ears of the founders and directors, of divinity, or theology, in a scheme of education, which pretends to be as comprehensive and “ *as universal as possible.*”

The absence of the statue of Brutus from the Roman procession was once accounted to be something ominous and fatal: but what shall we say when we look over the catalogue of sciences, and discover that religion, the end and crown of all, is alone wanting from the circle? In the case of Mechanics' Institutes, there is some shadow of excuse: the patrons of those establishments may say, "Our object is an open and a legitimate one; it is the scientific instruction of the people, in order to give them power and facility in the performance of their daily employments: to this object we confine ourselves, and we profess to do nothing more: their moral and religious education we leave to the government and the clergy." Even Mr. Bentham may assert, in defence of his *Chrestomathia*, that it is not religion alone which he excludes; that he also prevents literary composition, and ethics, and criticism, and rhetoric, and national and international law, and even "the all-directing art and science, logic, by some called metaphysics," from interfering with his "prophylactics," his "zohygiantics," and his "phthisozoics:" he may, besides, affirm that his day-school was intended merely for boys; that it was not called an university, nor meant to be an university; nor was the school of education declared to be "as universal as possible." But now listen to Mr. Campbell.

"I exhort the friends of the plan to give it the name of an University. I have been told that we ought not to call the proposed place an university, but a school; because we do not intend to ask for a power of conferring degrees. But why call it by any other name than what it will deserve? Now a school generally means a seminary for mere boys, and an university means, both in common parlance and in the dictionary, not a place for getting degrees, but for getting instruction *as universally as possible*. If there be ridicule, then, in disputing about words, let it fall exclusively on those who would distort their etymology. I would by no means abandon the title.

"In compliance with the wishes of several persons, whose favour towards the proposed new establishment for education in London it was thought expedient to propitiate, the projectors of a London University agreed to alter its title to that of a College.

"It is expressly understood, however, that not the slightest intention of altering the nature or extent of the establishment is implied in the change of name. *It is still intended to be a place of as universal education, as means can be found to make it.*"

But to place the matter more fully before our readers, we shall examine the reasons which are given for the omission, with the advantages which are alleged to result from it; and we shall then see how far they counterbalance the positive evil, the moral and intellectual mischief of separating religion from the whole comprehensive range of human knowledge.

We remember, when the first public meeting was held at the City of London Tavern, for the purpose of taking into consideration the propriety of establishing an university in London, to have heard Mr. Brougham deliver a violent and dogmatic oration, in which this topic was his principal theme, and at the end of which he had apparently assured himself, if he had not convinced his hearers, that he had set the matter completely at rest. As the assembly had evidently come together with the intention of applauding one side, and not of listening to both, Mr. Brougham flourished his arms in triumph, and remained master of the field. Yet we humbly conceive that he sang his pæan before the victory was gained; and although it would have been obviously unwise for any man to have then risked the character of a good cause, by advocating it among a set of persons who, in their liberal and enlightened notions about the advancement of knowledge, would have made it a point of honour to hoot him down, we are quite sure that a disputant of much lower abilities than those which Mr. Brougham possesses, might have so managed the controversy, as to have reminded him of the people mentioned by the Greek historian, who thought the battle concluded almost before it was begun, and whose enemies rushed upon them and routed them, at the very moment when they were erecting their trophy. To us, at least, the arguments adduced on this subject by Mr. Brougham and his partizans have always appeared about the most shallow and unsatisfactory which have ever been palmed upon the public easiness of belief, and disposition to take things for granted when roundly and plausibly affirmed. We may fairly state them to be as follows.

The first argument is the one which we have already seen used by Mr. Bentham, in his peculiar language, of "admittance pregnant with exclusion:" namely, that if religion be taught in the university, or, in other words, if the university be connected and identified with peculiar tenets on the subject of religion, a large number of persons will be excluded, who would otherwise have been glad to partake of its advantages. But we doubt the fact: we are rather inclined to think that the proportion of scholars who will stay away on account of the want of some positive religion, will be numerically greater than of those who would absent themselves because the doctrines of the Church of England are avowedly taught. Yet, for the sake of argument, let us suppose it to be otherwise: we would ask, why two or more collegiate institutions could not be founded in London, if the demand for a new university is so loud and general as has been pretended? There would be no want of professors; or the same professors in human sciences might lecture in both places at different hours, or on

different days; and connect with their several departments of knowledge that natural religion which is common to all Christian sects; while the particular views, on the basis of which each college or university was built, might be separately expounded by particular teachers. We would much rather see a “Dissenters’ University” established in London, in the next street to an university for the members of the church, and in fair and open opposition to it, or even a “Deists’ University” instituted in the same way, than one, like the present, which professes to admit all the other ingredients of knowledge, and rejects religion as something unwholesome and unpalatable. Nay, we would rather see the professors of various religious persuasions attend at times respectively appropriated to them,—although we are aware that this plan is not without many and serious inconveniences,—than we would have to remark the portentous chasm which is now left.

But it is said that *one* large institution for the purposes of collegiate education has this indisputable and striking superiority over two or more smaller ones, that all the scholars will have the benefit of a fuller library, a richer museum, and a more complete philosophical apparatus for illustration and experiments, than could be afforded by any single establishment on the other system. In answer to this assertion, we would say that a library, a museum, and a philosophical apparatus, abundantly sufficient for all practical uses, can neither be very expensive, nor very difficult to be procured. Here we have the authority of Mr. Brougham himself. He shows us that libraries, of very considerable extent, are actually possessed by the *mechanics* of several of our towns, where the population does not consist of many thousands. It must be recollected, too, that the students for the most part will provide their own books. A museum, in a city like London, where there are so many at hand, must be rather an ornamental than a necessary adjunct to the university: and with regard to a philosophical apparatus, Mr. Brougham writes—

“I reckon a small sum for apparatus. Great progress may be made in teaching with very cheap and simple experiments. Indeed, some of the most important, if not the most showy, are the least costly and complicated. By far the grandest discoveries in natural science were made with hardly any apparatus. A pan of water and two thermometers were the machinery that, in the skilful hands of Black, detected latent heat. A crown’s worth of glass, three penny worth of salt, a little chalk, and a pair of scales, enabled the same great philosopher to found the system of modern chemistry, by tracing the existence and the combinations of fixed air: with little more machinery the genius of Scheele created the materials of which the fabric was built, and anticipated some of the discoveries that have illustrated a later age. A prism, a lens, and

a sheet of pasteboard, enabled Newton to unfold the composition of light, and the origin of colours. Franklin ascertained the nature of lightning with a kite, a wire, a bit of riband, and a key: to say nothing of the great chemist of our own day, of whose most useful, perhaps most philosophical discovery, the principle might have been traced with the help of a common wire fire-guard. Even the elements of mechanics may be explained with apparatus almost as cheap and simple. There cannot be a doubt that a compendious set of machines may be constructed to illustrate, at a very cheap price, a whole course of lectures."

There might even be a library, a museum, and a philosophical apparatus for lectures, common to more than one college in London, while the studies and exercises of each were kept apart. We do not say that such a plan is desirable, but we do say that it is a less evil than the total want of religious instruction.

2. The next argument is, that to connect a new university with religion, is to create a source of endless and acrimonious disputes. It is urged that men may differ upon other sciences without anger or bitterness, or intemperance, but not upon religion. One professor, for instance, we are told, may teach one system of chemistry, and another professor may teach another, yet each may retain a strong respect and regard for the abilities and character of his rival: and then, in contrast to this mutual good-will, there comes some stale and common-place taunt about the "*odium theologicum*." Again we might answer, the facts are erroneously stated; but if we suppose them to be altogether true, what are they to the purpose? Who has ever wished that a new university should be made an arena for the controversies which will very possibly occur, as long as men are in earnest about their religious faith? The real and only question is, whether it would be better to have separate seminaries, in which the distinct tenets of various sects might be separately inculcated; or *one* of larger dimensions, and a more ambitious character, in which the religion of every sect is alike prohibited.

3. Oh! but say some of the advocates for the academy at the end of Gower Street—"we do not mean to exclude religion—our prohibition only extends to *contested points in theology*." It may be remarked, that a dislike to *religion* is never expressed by these gentlemen. "Theology" or "divinity" is invariably the word. But we should be glad to know what is the difference? we shall be glad to know, what points of theology are *uncontested*, and how much of religion will remain when the contested points of theology are taken away? "You must not leave Church of Englandism," says Mr. Bentham—and so say the Dissenters in general: "you must not leave the belief in the divinity or atonement of Jesus Christ," say the Unitarians:—"you must not leave the belief in

the Christian miracles," says the Deist:—"you must not leave the belief in a God," says the Atheist. To what point, then, will the directors of the new university advance?—at what point will they stop?—and what line of demarcation will they draw? Is their establishment opened to persons of *all* opinions, or is it not? Will they admit the Socinian, the Jew, the Infidel, Deistical, or Atheistical, or will they not? These questions must be answered. Have they settled the matter in their own minds? and do they see the dilemma to which they will inevitably be reduced? We should have thought our modern education-mongers to have been involved in mere confusion and uncertainty of ideas, but that we heard Mr. Brougham, in his tavern oration, talking upon these points with a hardihood, which would have been wonderfully amusing on any other subject; and very gravely insinuating that the projected college might justly claim the title of being the most religious university in the world, although it *had no professorship of theology*, since it was open to all religions, and had, besides, a tendency to prevent religious disputes. Clearly, the most effectual way to prevent religious disputes is, to have no religion; as the best cure for the tooth-ache is extraction of the tooth. For the rest, "*open to all, and influenced by none*," is the motto of a newspaper; perhaps Mr. Brougham will adopt it, as far as religion is concerned, for his most religious university. Yet there is one in Shakspeare, which, with a little alteration, might be rendered still more applicable:—"I will get Peter Quince to write a ballad of this dream; and it shall be called Bottom's Dream, because it hath no bottom."

The remaining arguments are, that the other sciences may be taught equally well without the introduction of theology; that physical knowledge has, of itself, a tendency to inspire religious feelings, instead of causing infidelity; and that religion is best taught at home, under the superintendence of parents. It will be more convenient to take these propositions into consideration, at the same time that we examine the positive and immediate disadvantages which must result from the exclusion of religion in a scheme of comprehensive education, than to sift and winnow them by a previous and separate scrutiny. To that examination, then, we shall now direct our attention.

We had really imagined, that if any one point was settled on the subject of the intellectual world, it was the close connexion of all the sciences, and the mutual light which they throw upon each other. Among almost innumerable passages which occur, both in ancient and modern writers, we select the following sentences from Bishop Horsley. "The sciences are said, and they are truly said, to have that mutual connexion, that any one of them

may be better understood for an insight into the rest. *And there is perhaps no branch of knowledge which receives more illustration from all the rest, than the science of religion.*" But, upon looking again, we find that we might have chosen an authority infinitely more to the purpose; namely, the identical prospectus lately issued by the council of the London University. It says, that they are endeavouring to establish "an institution of such magnitude, as to combine *the illustration and ornament, which every part of knowledge derives from every other*, with the advantage which accrues to all from the outward aids and instruments of libraries, museums, and apparatus." Again, it talks of a seminary, where the most eminent places in education may be restored to their natural rank among the ultimate and highest objects of pursuit. Yet, in the "institution of such magnitude," religion is left out, as if it were incapable of either bestowing or receiving any part of the assistance, illustration, and ornament, which *every* part of knowledge derives from every other; and in the seminary, where the most eminent places in education are to be restored to their natural rank, religion has no rank or station at all. We pass over the nonsense about restoring a *place* to a *rank*; because the object, which we have at this moment in view, is a very serious and important one; namely, to show that the separation of religion from human knowledge, inflicts a deep injury upon *both*.

It inflicts a deep injury upon human knowledge, because the truest wisdom, and the most exalted lessons, which can be drawn from the metaphysical or physical sciences, are of a religious nature. The rest are, in comparison, the mere husk of philosophy; and we are sincerely of opinion, that

"——the poor Indian, whose untutor'd mind
Sees God in clouds, and hears him in the wind,"

is a far more rational and intelligent being than the Sciologist, who pretends to survey all the phenomena of the material and intellectual universe, and then stops at second causes. But Mr. Brougham says, in his pamphlet addressed to the mechanics,

"Happily the time is past and gone, when *bigots* could persuade mankind that the lights of philosophy were to be extinguished as dangerous to religion; and when *tyrants* could proscribe the instructors of the people as enemies to their power. It is preposterous to imagine that the enlargement of our acquaintance with the laws which regulate the universe, can dispose to unbelief. *It may be a cure for superstition—for intolerance* it will be a most certain cure: but a pure and true religion has nothing to fear from the greatest expansion which the understanding can receive by the study either of matter, or of mind. The more widely science is diffused, the better will the Author of all things be known, and the less will the people be tossed to and fro by the slight of men and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive."

Agreeing, as we do, with the substance of these remarks, we shall not take notice of their tone, otherwise than by printing two or three of the expressions in *Italics*. But we shall take leave to turn Mr. Brougham's battery against himself. With what face can a man, who writes in this manner, assert either virtually, or in express terms, that the sciences may be taught equally well, without reference to theology? We can tell Mr. Brougham, that natural philosophy is likely to lead to belief or unbelief, exactly in proportion as it is, or is not, connected with theology at every stage of the pupil's progress. Yet, by the very constitution of his projected university, there is a great gulf fixed between theology and science. But, if natural religion is to be inculcated in conjunction with natural philosophy, in that case a material departure is at once made from the spirit of the plan, the fundamental principle of the university; or it becomes evident, that the design is not to exclude theology, or natural religion, but merely to prohibit Christianity. Tom Paine himself affirms, "all the sciences should be studied *theologically*;" here we coincide with Paine to the very letter; but we wish to carry the observation much farther than he would be disposed to go. We assert, that the physical sciences not only lose their highest use, and interest, and importance, when they are disjoined from natural religion; but, that they are necessarily connected, and the observation applies with tenfold force to the *moral and political* sciences, with the doctrines of *revealed* religion. Mr. Brougham has asked—for we well recollect the substance of his question, although we do not affect to quote the exact words—what can points of divinity have to do with discussions about the elements of material objects—about acids and alkalis—about quartz and mica? Yet he must surely know, that natural philosophy and chemistry have been brought forward to disprove the resurrection of the body, and that modern systems of geology have an obvious bearing upon the Mosaic account of the creation and the flood.

But the matter requires a more minute investigation. We shall, therefore, mention the several departments of study, which are included in the course of the London University; and then see, whether they can be adequately taught without reference to religion, both natural and revealed. We confidently defy the projectors and defenders of this new institution to maintain the affirmative. We challenge them to a discussion of the proposition, as being one which is well worthy of notice in a merely speculative point of view; while it also deeply and essentially affects the best interests of mankind. And be it remarked, that the question now put is not, to what conclusion the mind must come, as to either natural or revealed religion, but whether it be possible, fully and

properly, to expound the departments of study embraced by the scheme of the London University, without touching both upon the one and the other? This simple inquiry, as it appears to us, involves the whole character of the system; and by its determination the institution must stand or fall. We shall take the studies as they are at present; although our case might be strengthened by the consideration that their number, according to the prospectus, is liable to be indefinitely augmented.

These departments of knowledge are thirty-two, comprised under eight general heads, among which, it must be here superfluous to say, that the word Religion, or Theology, is not to be found. The *first* of these is Language. Now, what lecturer or professor, upon the face of the globe, will dare to commit himself by the declaration, that it is possible to take an adequate and comprehensive survey of language, either philosophically or historically, without paying some regard to its origin or structure; or to regard its origin and structure, without examining whether it be the discovery of man, or the gift of God; or to settle this controversy without considering, whether all languages were the same in the earliest ages of the human race; and, if so, how and from what causes the difference has arisen; or, again, to do any one of these things without making some reference to the written word, which treats of the speech of Adam, and the tower of Babel? The absurdity of such a declaration, if it were made, would be beneath the notice of a school-boy.

The fifth head—since for reasons, which will presently appear, we do not intend to proceed regularly through the list—embraces the “Moral Sciences,” which are specified as being—1. “Moral and Political Philosophy. 2. Jurisprudence, including International Law. 3. English Law, with (perhaps) separate Lectures on the Constitution. 4. Roman Law.” With the logical accuracy of this extraordinary enumeration of the moral sciences, we shall not interfere; but we ask, how any professor, how any person of common sense, can disjoin the study of ethics from all religious, or theological speculations? how, without inquiries about the accountability of man to a superior being—to whatever conclusions they may lead—he can arrange and settle his ideas as to the foundations of right and wrong—the nature of *duty*, the meaning of the word “*ought*?” Like the ancient sages, or, rather like the Philosopher Square, recorded in Tom Jones, he may prate about prudence, utility, and the unalterable fitness of things; but he will never ascertain even his own notions upon the merest elements of ethical philosophy, without either admitting, or rejecting, the existence, the superintendence, and the moral government of a Deity. But farther, to talk of a professorship

for "*English Law, with (perhaps) separate Lectures on the Constitution,*" without noticing the religion of the country, and the religious establishment connected with the state, is so monstrous a piece of folly, that it would be scarcely a less one to waste more words upon its exposure.

The sixth head is "*History.*" And it is seriously proposed to give lectures upon history, where one vast branch is entirely ecclesiastical; and where the principal events of the other two branches, namely, civil and military history, have almost invariably some bearing upon religion, either in their causes or their consequences, without taking the character of that religion into account, and expressing some opinion upon religious topics! We shall not insult the understandings of our readers by adding another syllable.

The other heads, which we have not already mentioned, relate to the mathematical, physical, metaphysical, political, economical and medical sciences. We have to offer one important remark, which is applicable to them all. There is not one of them, which has not been made, and which is not daily made, the instrument of scientific infidelity. The anatomist attacks the foundation of all moral responsibility, by tracing to a purely material origin the phenomena of thought; and builds a scheme of necessity upon the supposed structure and functions of the brain. The cranio-logist, or phrenologist, does much the same thing; sometimes, perhaps, without any such consciousness or design; for many a man publishes a system without perceiving the consequences of his own doctrine. A metaphysician, like Hume, will endeavour to persuade us, that a belief in the Christian miracles is utterly irrational from the constitution of the human mind; or he will attempt to reduce man to a mere machine of a more ingenious and complicated frame than other animate or inanimate bodies, by destroying the freedom of the will. The mathematician and natural philosopher will attribute the wonders of the universe to mechanical agency—to fortuitous concurrences, the possibility of which he will calculate by the doctrine of chances; to the necessary concatenation of causes and effects. It is needless farther to illustrate the argument, by a reference to political economy, or geology, or chemistry. In a word, it is a peculiar characteristic of the scepticism of the day, that it draws its choicest and most numerous weapons from the armoury of science. Disquisitions upon verbal criticism, or the historical authenticity of the sacred books, require some degree of learning and studious research: besides, the champions of Christianity have so well disposed of this part of the controversy, as to have driven from the field the most acute and formidable of its antagonists. But,

on the other hand, a slight and superficial acquaintance with the physical sciences is now so common an attainment, that hundreds of sciolists can shoot off some philosophical popgun against the rock of ages.

It should also be borne in mind, that the natural bias of youth is almost always towards scepticism. And such is the case, not merely because, as Bacon says, "a little philosophy inclines us to atheism, and a great deal of philosophy carries us back to religion:" but youth has an intellectual bias against religion, because it would humble the arrogance of the understanding; and a moral bias against it, because it would check the self-indulgence of the passions. In the same degree, youth has a directly opposite bias in favour of scientific infidelity; because it seems to emancipate the mind from superstition and prejudice; and because it lays few restraints upon the gratification of the desires.

Here, therefore, we perceive in what way the separation of religion from human knowledge inflicts a deep injury upon the former. This unnatural estrangement deprives religion of that peculiar glory which consists in crowning and harmonizing all the departments of intellectual study, and elevating them to their highest dignity and use, while it also cripples its means of defence against the shafts of argument and ridicule which are launched from the quiver of shallow science or mistaken philosophy. The enthusiast may fanatically imagine that profane learning is unnecessary or hurtful to the teacher of religion; but the more enlightened theologian will look upon the whole world of nature and art, the whole range of literature, of science, as a commentary upon the word of God, and will be aware that he can never be completely prepared to fight the good fight of faith, unless he be armed at all points with human knowledge, as well as with divine truth. The true interests of both are identified; nor can we conceive a more miserable system than one which, if universally acted upon, would provide for England, in the next generation, ministers of religion deficient in human learning, and men of learning destitute of religion.

Here also we may observe that the religion which is likely to be instilled at home, and under the superintendence of parents, must be a sorry substitute for the lessons of professed scholars, whose lives are devoted to intellectual pursuits. We by no means deny the necessity, or undervalue, the power, of domestic inculcation of religious principles: we are well convinced that such principles cannot be impressed too early, or too carefully, upon the heart and understanding of the child. But we must recollect, that the proposed establishment is *not* a preparatory day-school, *is not* a seminary intended for the tuition of young gentlemen

about seven or eight years of age, but an University—or, as Mr. Campbell explains the word, a place of universal education for persons of all ages, and all opinions. It is idle, in such a case, to talk of the religious instruction which the parents can afford: for when we look at things as they really are, who will these parents be? In general, and at best, they will be bankers, merchants, or tradesmen of respectability;—men who may be very sincere and very rational believers in Christianity, yet who will probably have taken up their system of faith upon practical grounds; and who will therefore be unable to refute scientific objections, or satisfy the scruples of a young sceptic, although their sound good sense may be a sufficient antidote to the effect of such scruples upon themselves. Science must be opposed to science: the excellent advice of an honest soap-boiler, or the pious exhortations of an honest soap-boiler's wife, will be but an unequal match for the partial facts and subtle plausibilities of an infidel metaphysician, or chemist, or physiologist. The inevitable conclusion is, that religion and human knowledge should be taught in conjunction—should be engrained together on the intellect, and accompany each other through all the process of scholastic education. We wish to see religion considered as the Alpha and Omega—the beginning and end of wisdom; not as a dark and repulsive mystery, placed in opposition to it. We wish to see the knowledge of the Deity in education, what the Deity himself is in the Universe—the directing and vivifying principle of the whole.

It may be said, that if scientific works are written on the side of infidelity, their influence will be more than counteracted by others written on the side of religion; particularly in a country where such high premiums are offered for orthodox exertions. This may be, or may not be. We have no apprehensions that error will obtain a lasting or general triumph over truth: we simply dread that scepticism may obtain a temporary hold upon individual minds during the inexperience of youth, and in the hey-day of early dissipation. It is not enough that books are written; there must be also a willingness to read them, and a disposition fully and dispassionately to weigh and appreciate their contents. At any rate, is the religious character of so little importance, as to be trusted to the chapter of accidents? Why must the hazard be incurred? or why is the scheme of education so woefully incomplete?

As to parental guidance, we find, that if the anticipations of the projectors are realized, there will be cases in which it cannot possibly be at hand for the members of the new London University.

We quote again from the Prospectus.

“ For the good effects expected in other seminaries from discipline,

the council put their trust in the power of home, and the care of parents, to whom in this Institution, which is equally open to youth of every religious persuasion, the important duty of religious education is necessarily, as well as naturally entrusted. That care, always the best, wherever it can be obtained, will assuredly be adequate to every purpose in the case of the residents of London, who must at first be the main foundation of the establishment. When its reputation attracts many pupils *from the country and the colonies*, those means of private instruction and domestic superintendence may be adopted, which have been found in other places to be excellent substitutes for parental care."

We have already exposed the fallacy contained in the first part of this extract: as to the latter, we would simply ask, what proper religious instruction is likely to be provided for these unfortunate beings who are to be imported "from the country and the colonies"? we mean in that rational and exalted view of the matter, of which, by the way, it is evident that the writers of the Prospectus have not even a glimpse—which would connect the philosophy of religion with all their other studies and attainments in knowledge? Already in imagination we hear some unhappy stripling exclaiming, like Andrew in "The Ordinary,"—

"Here's no proofs,
No doctrines, nor no uses. Tutor, I
Would fain learn some religion."

It seems that in the London University there will be very little either moral or intellectual discipline. As to moral, the case is plain enough: as to intellectual, the Prospectus states, "the number of the professors, the allotment of particular branches to individuals, and *the order in which the Lectures ought to be attended*, are matters not yet finally settled; and some of them must partly depend in the first instance on the *qualification of candidates*; others will permanently be regulated by *the demands for different sorts of instruction*." But Mr. Campbell is for "absolute liberty." He allows that "*indirect* modes might be found for influencing the general course of studies, without interfering with the absolute liberty of the student:" but just above he declares, "*it consists with the liberal principles of the present age, that the projected college should leave its students free to attend whatever classes, and in whatever succession they think fit*." Are then all the habits of mental discipline and self-government, of commanding the attention and fixing it upon studies which are the most highly valuable in their fruits, although at first irksome and of forbidding aspect, to be offered up upon the shrine of these "liberal principles of the age," and "the absolute liberty" of boys of fourteen? For our parts, we would rather trust to the discretion of a professor of education, who is thoroughly

acquainted with the sequence of ideas, and the natural development of the faculties, than to the choice of any tradesman in London, however respectable, or of any boy whatever—for we are not speaking of young men—even although his head had been duly felt and examined by Dr. Spurzheim or Mr. De Ville for that especial purpose. Let the father select the school or institution to which his son is to be sent; but let every school or institution have its own ascertained character and course of intellectual pursuits.

But then this freedom of choice seems required in an university; and the present establishment must be an University, for the greater glory of its projectors. And how is it to be converted into an University, in spite of the general age of the pupils, the absence of the power of conferring degrees, and certain other circumstances, which, in the opinion of Mr. Campbell, may be undeserving of mention? Why, in the first place, persons of all sorts and sizes are to be admissible: it is, says Mr. Campbell, “to be capable of instructing people as long as they wish to be instructed. And what says the Prospectus? “By the formation of an University in this metropolis, the useful intercourse of theory with active life will be facilitated; speculation will be instantly tried and corrected by practice; and the *man of business* will more readily find principles which will bestow simplicity and order on his experimental knowledge.” What! is the man of business to go to the London University? We really ask for information, as we profess an utter inability to see our way through all the mazes of the plan. Moreover, Mr. Campbell suggests, “in the evening there might be popular lectureships for *grown people, on the plan of other institutions.*” Are the ladies then to be edified in the evening at the London University, either by its own professors, or by occasional speculators, to whom the collegiate establishment is to be let, like the theatre of the Mechanics’ Institute, or the large room at the Crown and Anchor? Nothing less, we suppose, would “consist with the liberal principles of the present age.”

But there is another ingenious device for eking out an University. A College of Medicine is to be added: “the various branches of knowledge” are to be taught, “which are the objects of medical education:” and there are to be “clinical lectures, as soon as a *hospital* can be connected with this establishment.” Are there then no hospitals, and is there no medical education already in London?—or do the projectors conceive that in England a day-school and a hospital will make an University? Here is a place of education for boys and youths and adults—we had almost said for men, women, and children—without religious, or moral, or intellectual discipline;—a place where no rules seem to be accurately fixed, and no aim to be steadily preserved;—a place where,

in the wild attempt to embrace every thing at once, *general* education is mixed and confounded with *professional*. On one side we see a school-boy listening to a professor of languages: on the other, a young man sitting by the bedside of a patient in a hospital. And if the London University is to supersede Guy's Hospital and Bartholomew's Hospital, why does it not also affect to supplant the Temple and Lincoln's Inn, or to teach the minutiae of every trade and profession under the sun. The slightest reflection will show, that the case is by no means parallel to the military education at Woolwich and Sandhurst, or the clerical education which is, to a certain degree, connected with the usual studies at Oxford or Cambridge.

What too can be expected from a council composed of such discordant and heterogeneous materials? How can they ever amalgamate and "work together for good?" The members of the council are to look after the professors, and prevent them from teaching pernicious doctrines: but who is to look after the members of the council, and prevent them from making the establishment a seminary for the instilment of seditious or irreligious opinions. We want *permanent statutes*—known and settled regulations, on the basis of which the whole institution is to be conducted—not a temporary and fluctuating council, where the various individuals, as for instance the Duke of Norfolk and Mr. Mill, or Lord Dudley and Ward and Mr. Hume, cannot pull the same way; and where, in all human probability, the men of highest rank and stake in the country will be only the sleeping partners, glad to leave the real management of the concern to two or three bustling meddlers, who are eager to rise into notoriety and importance, or anxious to render the University an engine for the furtherance of their own private schemes. It may "consist with the liberal principles of the present age" to plant a learned and scientific institution upon the footing of a joint-stock company: it may consist with the same liberal principles to exhibit it, in its internal constitution, as a perfect republic or democracy; but we doubt very much whether it consists with the wisdom of parliament to bestow upon it the legal privileges which it asks, or extend to it any sanction.

For how is the legislature to know *what* it sanctions. What sufficient guarantee can be given by an establishment, of which the system is so latitudinarian and indefinite; and which, for aught that has yet appeared, may not be conducted in the same spirit to-morrow as to-day? The *only* certain and peculiar feature in the project is the prohibition of religious instruction.

But we must hasten to the conclusion of this protracted article. It has been our business from the commencement of it, not so much to examine any single Institution under all the aspects

which it might present itself, as to trace the same spirit running through many institutions and many plans; and thus far we have beheld the same actors playing nearly the same parts, upon somewhat different scenes.

Upon a survey of the whole system, we can have no hesitation in declaring our agreement with Mr. Rose, upon the main point, that the mechanical and physical sciences are pursued with an undue preference over the metaphysical, the moral, and the theological. The tendency of the system is to make us more and more an active, money-getting, utilitarian people: and, at best, to raise Franklins among us, according to the wish of Mr. Brougham; or men, acute, calculating, and industrious to the greatest degree, but deficient in those higher, more disinterested, and less worldly qualities, which have, after all, the greatest share in elevating the character of individuals, and promoting the true welfare of the human race. If, indeed, the actual condition of a country may be taken, as a test of its rank and station in intellectual improvement, it is quite evident from the excellence of our machinery and manufactures; the facility of loco-motion; and the perfection of the useful arts;—that those departments of knowledge, which contribute to the convenience, the comfort, and the ornament of animal life, have made the most rapid and gigantic strides in advance; but in the quantity of public crimes, and private vices; in the misery and disturbance caused by them in society; in that deficiency of loftiness of mind and moral self-command, which depend upon the power of virtue, for virtue also is power, we are far from perceiving a corresponding progress in ethics, or in religion. The same phenomena are observable in the political aspect of the times; for the spirit of politics and of education will naturally be alike, as the things themselves are reciprocally connected, and must act and re-act upon each other. In all which regards the wealth and commerce of the kingdom, new and more liberal regulations are adopted almost by acclamation; yet much carelessness is often manifested upon matters which more nearly concern its intrinsic strength, and its real prosperity and happiness.

With the general tenor, too, of Mr. Rose's argument, we cordially concur:—we believe with him, and Hume, and a multitude of antecedent writers, that moral science is of far more value and more dignity than physical; inasmuch as—to use the words of Locke—"the intellectual world is a larger and more beautiful world than the material;"—and the mind and soul of man are of superior importance to his body: we think him right, where he asserts, "it should be our earnest desire so to bestow our labour, and so to use the world, as to improve our being to the highest

pitch for its future destiny; and in comparison of this end, we should despise and condemn all immediate utility and present reward." We would also say, that at a period, when so much stress is laid upon the mechanical and economical sciences; when immediate utility and present reward are so steadily pursued, as the chief and primary objects of intellectual research; when, in short, *practical* education, as it is called, is all in all:—at such a period, we sincerely and heartily desire, that sound ethical and metaphysical learning may find a refuge and protection in our old and venerable universities:—that no paltry sarcasms may have the effect of discouraging the pursuit of polite and elegant literature, and more particularly of the classical poets and historians, those everlasting models of correctness and purity of taste;—that a stricter attention may be paid to pure, abstract, logical truths;—that the ultimate purposes and reflective efficacy of knowledge may be kept steadily in view;—and that the higher and more liberal, and—if the terms practical and speculative must be retained in a foolish opposition to each other—more *speculative* sciences, may find countenance and support in proportion to the neglect, which they too generally encounter among the modern legislators upon education; and in order to counteract this prevalent and pernicious spirit of the age.

Upon what points then, and in what degree, do we differ from Mr. Rose? We think that he has inadvertently pushed his sentiments too far; that he has suffered his zeal to outstrip his judgment, and has thus supplied fresh weapons and plausible ground of attack to the adversaries of the opinions which he advocates. We think, too, that he has manifested want of caution, by recommending, in more places than one, the improvement of our moral and intellectual being as the *only* legitimate object of human knowledge; by estranging philosophy from literature, and placing them in opposition; and by decrying the physical and experimental sciences, for the purpose of raising in our estimation the logical and the pure. This, in our opinion, is a serious mistake; there neither is, nor can be, any natural opposition between the objective and subjective sciences: nor can the interests of the one class be advanced or promoted by the discredit which is thrown upon the other. So far are they from being things which ought to be weighed in the balance each against each; or placed, like contending forces, in hostile array; that they afford mutual light and assistance, and should be taken together through every step of our intellectual training. In strict language indeed, our metaphysical knowledge can only be called into being by our observation of external nature: the phenomena of thought and consciousness must always have originally occurred to us in conjunc-

tion with objects presented to our senses. Without a perception of the material world, the very existence of such sciences as logic, or ethics, or the ontology of the schools, is absolutely inconceivable.

- Again, our objective and subjective knowledge will often increase at the same time and in the same proportion. For instance, there is a severe and exact logic necessarily included in physico-mathematical inquiries. Could the investigations of Newton, or La Place, be pursued for a moment without developing and strengthening the higher faculties of the mind, as well as exercising the attention and the memory? And, if this truth be allowed by Mr. Rose with regard to mathematical sciences, how can he fairly dispute it with respect to the other regions in the vast empire of Physics,—to the discoveries, for example, of a Werner, a Lavoisier, a Davy, or a Watt?

Moreover, as the various departments of knowledge, although they are different, cannot be contradictory in their nature, so neither is there any real opposition in the ends for which they are pursued. One object may be beyond comparison higher than another;—but what is the utility, we would ask, of separating and contrasting them, when they may be, and ought to be, attained at once and by the same means? It is possible, we believe, to load the memory with physical facts, or chemical deductions, without any concomitant improvement of the logical powers of the understanding; but this misfortune, when it occurs, must wholly arise from a wretched method of instruction: with a decent proportion of care and skill on the part of the teacher, or the inquirer, the direct and reflective benefits of human study will be secured together. The proposition is, in fact, so evident, that to dispute it, after deliberating for a few moments, is to remain obstinately blind to a dispensation of Providence, wonderful alike in its mercy and in its wisdom. To prepare ourselves for a state of existence, which will last throughout eternity, is a matter of infinitely deeper and more awful concern, than to acquire temporal comfort and prosperity:—but the pursuits, by which man will make the nearest approximations to the perfections of his nature, and render himself a fitter recipient for an immortality of happiness, are the very means by which, in general cases, he will most effectually promote the secular welfare of himself and his fellow-creatures. The same harmony and accordance have been established by the goodness of God in intellectual speculation, as may be observed in practical conduct: and as many of the prophecies of holy writ were so propounded, as to have a primary and secondary accomplishment;—the one immediately discernible from outward events,—the other, silently advancing to its completion, and

ultimately to be manifested in the sight of men and angels ; so every kind of learning may be so pursued, as directly to furnish us with a knowledge of phænomena in the material universe, and a consequent extension of our dominion over nature :—and, indirectly, to produce still nobler and more valuable consequences, by strengthening the intellect, refining the taste, and elevating the imagination. In a word, if we begin with ethical or logical studies, they can never receive their proper illustration without a reference to sensible objects ; nor have their full use, without an application to physical purposes :—if we devote our thoughts to geological, or chemical, or mathematical pursuits, we must also attend to the subjective and logical truths connected with the philosophy of mind which are, as it were, evolved and brought out in the very process of our investigations.

There is yet another point which we would submit to the consideration of Mr. Rose. As man is a being made up of soul and body, of physical wants and moral capabilities, the departments of knowledge, which contribute to the health, the comfort, and the convenience of the animal frame, must form a large and indispensable part of human study, even for the sake of those nobler attributes of our nature, which are interwoven with the material and grosser particles. In individuals, the possession of immense wealth may be unfavourable to the improvement of the understanding and the morals, but abject poverty is incompatible with such amelioration. Among nations, those which are most oppressed by physical privations and necessities will be always found in the lowest state of moral and intellectual debasement. Wisdom and virtue have no enemy like want. The fact is equally proved by the history of the world, and every man's personal experience, or by reasonings *à priori* from the constitution of our being. It is worse than idle to oppose their united force ; or to deny on the other hand, that when adequate provision has been made for the body, more time, more power, and more opportunities are created for the cultivation of the mind : and therefore that the advancement of medical, chemical, and economical science must be serviceable, upon a comprehensive view of men and things, to the interests of logical, ethical, and metaphysical learning. If it be true, that a slight corporeal ailment may derange the whole machine, and that the faculties of the mind, sublime and marvellous as they are, may suffer a temporary eclipse from a fit of indigestion ; time cannot altogether be thrown away upon the “ Hygionics ” of Mr. Bentham, or the *Gymnastics* of Captain Clias, and Professor Volkaer. But it must be considered on the other hand, that, beyond a certain point, as Mr. Mill has observed, “ muscular strength is liable to operate unfavourably upon the

moral, as well as the intellectual, trains of thought; is apt to withdraw the owner from mental pursuits, and engage him in such as are more of the animal kind—the acquisition and display of physical powers.”

Mr. Rose seems to apprehend, that men will be so saturated with Mechanical and Chemical Philosophy, as to be unable to imbibe moral and religious knowledge: his opponents appear to think the latter kind of instruction of so little importance, as to be hardly worth the trouble of being instilled. The one party would disconnect logical from physical studies; the other would not lead physical up to metaphysical or logical. Mr. Rose is all for the reflective efficacy of science in elevating the character; the founders of Mechanics' Institutes lay the sole or principal stress upon its direct and visible effects in improving the condition. The latter look upon inductive and experimental investigations as the noblest employment of the human understanding; the former speak of empirical philosophy, almost like a German transcendentalist;—almost indeed in the spirit of Leibnitz, who was long inclined to reject the Newtonian theory of universal gravitation, because he had no arguments to prove it *à priori*. Mr. Rose describes that exertion as “*unmeaning*,” which has not some palpable bearing upon man's ultimate and immortal destiny; while the system of his adversaries has been apparently conceived in accordance with the principle which has been openly broached by some pretended philosophers upon the continent:—that the greatest mistake which moralists or legislators have ever committed, has been to mix up the individual capacity of man, as a moral or accountable being, with his social and political relations, and that the concerns of this world would go on infinitely better, and the state of its inhabitants be ameliorated in an incalculable degree, if the question of another were never taken into consideration for a moment. Here the utilitarian theory is nakedly avowed, and pushed to its full extent: and it is merely a partial conclusion from it, that an Established Church is an absurdity and a nuisance.

Thus it is, that extremes beget extremes, and that much of real knowledge is lost amid the excesses of contrary opinions. The systems are made to recede in a mutual and mistaken antipathy—as if repulsion were a more general law than attraction in the intellectual world—instead of being, as they might be, amalgamated, harmonized, and combined to the common benefit of both. Instead of being considered as sisters or allies, bound in an indissoluble knot,

“*Segnesque nodum solvere Gratia,*”

the different departments of study are now too often treated as competitors and rivals. Yet we might learn from the Scriptures that the glory of the sciences is in their union, for we are taught that wisdom is "one only manifold:" and that "there is time for every purpose and for every work."

For ourselves, we decry nothing: we would omit nothing. We believe, that both sides are right until they become exclusive. We do not reject *in toto* the theory of the utilitarian; but we think that utility is neither the *sole* principle to which human actions can be referred; nor the *sole* standard by which they should be tried. It is a joint and co-ordinate—not a single and supreme arbiter. We also think, that, *even upon the principle of utility*, moral and religious knowledge is the highest and truest of all wisdom. For upon this system, the measure of value by which knowledge is appreciated, is *not* the power, or wealth—for these are only inferior ends, or rather means, to the one ultimate end—but the happiness which it produces: and assuredly there is neither so much happiness caused by the possession, nor so much misery by the want, of any science whatever, as of that which regulates the passions and appetites—instils unfading contentment and sublime hope under the severest sorrows and privations—apportions our wishes to our capabilities—restrains the excesses, which are more fearful disturbing forces in the social world, than earthquakes and hurricanes in the material, and is necessary for every human being in every situation and at every moment of life. Yet, whatever be its comparative littleness or meanness, there is no art, and no department of intellectual research, which we wish to disparage, or which we can consider as in itself unworthy of attention.

It will be idle, therefore, to suppose of us, that we are enemies to mental activity in any of its legitimate pursuits. Our desire is, to equalize the balance of knowledge, not by detracting from one scale, but by throwing a greater weight into its opposite. Our hope and trust is, that the tide of intellectual improvement may be never destined to have an ebb. We do not ask, that the machine of science should be stopped; but that some new springs should be added, and the rest adjusted in better harmony and proportion; in order that the action of the whole may be surer and more beneficial. Would we arrest the mechanic, or the mechanic's child, as he is beginning to run the race of knowledge, as he is striving to pass within the threshold of philosophy? Would we repulse him, as he presses forward to the goal: and debar him from quenching his thirst at the living waters of scientific truth?—Our habits, our feelings, and our prepossessions run the other way. But we do wish, that mechanical science may

never constitute all, or the larger part, of the instruction, which is bestowed upon English artizans. We do wish, that their Institutes may be conducted in a quiet, rational, and unassuming spirit; and we entertain the wish less for the sake of the higher classes than of the workmen themselves. Upon the design of rendering science practical, and practice scientific, we have already bestowed the tribute of our applause; but we cannot forget, that there are other and higher objects more important by far, both to states and individuals, for the loss of which the utmost perfection of theoretical attainments and actual skill would be a most sorry and insignificant compensation.

As to the foundation of a new University, if there be need of such an establishment, let it be founded, and let it prosper! We feel, that to a sanguine and philanthropic mind the project recommends itself at once; and possesses attractions, which it might require in any case some effort of the reason to resist. Opposition to it, on the other hand, can hardly fail to carry some semblance at first sight of paltry jealousy, or illiberal and narrow conceptions.—Yet we shall not be deterred from stating our assurance, that the University now in progress has been undertaken upon views rather loose and ambitious, than comprehensive and profound: or from declaring our sincere belief, that it would be unwise for Parliament to confer upon it any legal privileges which can be constitutionally withheld;—until the Directors shall have reconsidered their Prospectus;—until they shall have come forward with a more matured scheme, and less unphilosophical arrangements;—and until they have recognized the truth of the proposition, “Education, unless grounded upon religious principles, may be a curse instead of a blessing. Education, with religion, is the greatest good, which man can bestow on man.”

ART. XIV.—*Pastoral Watchfulness and Zeal: particularly in Personal Instruction and Admonition. Recommended in Two Sermons preached at the Bishop's Visitation at Abingdon, August 21, 1826, and August 30, 1814, by the Rev. Edward Berens, M.A., Vicar of Shoreham, Berks. Rivingtons, London. Parker, Oxford. 1s.*

WE have derived so much pleasure from the former publications of Mr. Berens, that we perused the two discourses now before us with a strong prepossession in his favour; and we have not been disappointed. The same simple, unpretending style, the

same modest yet decided tone that ran through his other volumes, is still employed.

We quote the following passage as a specimen of the feeling and impressive manner in which Mr. Berens urges one the most important duties of the clergy: and it is only in the hope that these excellent discourses may be more universally known than visitation sermons usually are, that we abstain from extracting a larger portion of them.

“We are to take heed unto *all* the flock. No individual in a parish is to be considered as beneath or as beyond our pastoral care. If our public ministrations are well attended, and successful in turning many to righteousness, there is proportionably the less need of private exertion. Many, however, of those who are present at our sermons, are slow in deriving any real and permanent benefit from them; and many neglect them altogether. What shall we then do?—Shall we say of such men, that the Church is open to them, and that if they obstinately refuse to attend the public instruction of the Church, it is their own fault, their blood be upon their own heads? Oh, no. None of us, I am sure, can deem so lightly of those endless sufferings, the intermination of which forms so painful but sometimes so necessary a part of our pastoral addresses. We *must* not—we *can* not so leave them to perish. Their absenting themselves from the public ordinances of religion is an additional proof how urgently they need to be admonished, and warned to flee from the wrath to come. We must,—at least when the largeness of a parish does not preclude attention to individuals—we *must* follow them to their homes; and guided by ministerial zeal and Christian prudence, must seek and watch for opportunities of awakening them from their spiritual lethargy, and of exciting them to think seriously of the salvation of their souls.” (p. 21.) Again,

“I acknowledge that it is with the deepest self-abasement that I reflect on the pledge I gave, and think how imperfectly I have redeemed it. Whenever the solemn and peculiar toll of the bell tells me that one of my parishioners has been summoned to his last account, the sound comes over me accompanied by a feeling of my own responsibility; and when informed who the departed person is, and again when the body is finally laid in the grave, I am generally led to reflect—too often to reflect painfully—whether I have done all that I reasonably might have done for his spiritual welfare,—to think what *could have been done more for that man's salvation that I have not done for it.*” (p. 24.)

ART. XV.—*The Office of the Christian Teacher, considered: in a Sermon preached August 23, 1826, in St. Giles's Church, Reading, at the Primary Visitation of the Lord Bishop of Salisbury; and printed at the request of his Lordship and the Clergy.* By the Rev. H. H. Milman, Vicar of St. Mary, Reading. 2s. 6d. Murray, London. Parker, Oxford. 1826.

IN this eloquent discourse Mr. Milman considers the manner of preaching which Christian ministers ought to adopt.—“The human soul,” he observes, “is accessible through three principal faculties, the Imagination, the Reason, and the Passions or Affections.”—And his object is to show, that if any of these approaches be neglected, or be exclusively or unduly frequented, great mischief must ensue. His description of the effects produced in the Church of Rome by too frequent appeals to the imagination, will convey some idea to our readers of the vigour and warmth with which his task is executed.

“The religion of the dark ages, to almost the whole of which the Roman Catholic church adheres with blind and unwise pertinacity, was addressed exclusively to the imagination, and found its way through the imagination alone to the feelings. If this system was formed and perfected in misjudging compliance with the state of the human mind, candour as well as charity will acknowledge, that the motive for its original adoption may have been pious and Christian. The progress of barbarism and the progress of Roman Catholic doctrines were simultaneous. For in the barbarian, as in the child, the imagination is the most active and easily excited faculty, the reason is dormant. The Christian therefore was taught by symbolic representation rather than argument, and the prophetic office delegated to the outward ceremony and significant rite. Thus the imagination being the only channel by which religious knowledge could easily be conveyed, its task was facilitated by all practicable means; every thing was as far as possible brought down to the comprehension of the senses, and the conceptions of the imagination assisted by embodying, as it were, the truths of religion in the painting and the statue. The whole of the evangelic history, to say nothing of the monstrous and incoherent legends which were engrafted upon it, all the facts of Christianity were made graphic and visible: the life of Christ was told by pictures of his miracles, his death preached by the crucifix. Wherever oral teaching was attempted, the preacher held the Cross in his hand, and exemplified and enforced the truth of its arguments by pointing to the wounds, and appealing to the bleeding image. That however which began in pious condescension to the weakness of man, ended in confirming that weakness, and substituting a superstition almost heathen for the spiritual doctrine of Christianity. That which was first adopted to enforce the higher articles of the creed on an ignorant and unreasoning people, became itself the creed. The ritual,

which was intended to preach by lively representations, hallowed its forms and images, as if they were an integral and essential part of the religion. All those doctrines which were subsequently abused by the fraud, or retained by the blindness of ecclesiastical tyranny, grew up gradually out of this system of teaching. Not only the worship of images, of saints and angels, with that of the Virgin, but unquestionably transubstantiation itself, and the sacrifice of the mass, may be deduced from the increasing desire of governing the public mind through the imagination. The symbol was transformed into the God, by precisely the same process that the pagan idol, which represented the attributes of some immaterial and beneficent being, became the actual adored and dreaded divinity. Hence throughout Christendom, instead of gazing with awful horror and devout humility upon the secrets of the immaterial world, the whole was familiarized, and with daring, though unintentional profanation, exhibited in distinct and vivid lineaments. The celestial hierarchy of heaven was disciplined and marshalled into ranks and orders; each angel had his office and function. Hell was laid open with equal presumption; and to complete the system, the more accessible region of purgatory gained an easy belief. A perpetual intercourse took place between this world and the next; every thing which occurred within this nearer place of probation was under the direct cognizance of the priesthood. Souls returned in visible forms, or at least with audible voices, to demand the masses which were to shorten their purgation, or to bear witness to their efficacy in expediting the work of final salvation. Even the heaven of heavens was not secure against the profane invasion; the Immaterial, the Incomprehensible, He, whom no one but the Son hath seen, was embodied. The Trinity itself assumed form and substance, the ineffable union was described, not in words only, but in forms and colours; and represented under whatever symbols appeared most appropriate."—pp. 21—24.

Mr. Milman intimates the possibility of attempting hereafter a more full development of the theory here suggested.—We shall rejoice at the fulfilment of his intention; but venture at the same time to suggest, that it should be preceded by a more careful examination of that part of the subject which relates to the imagination; and that his remarks respecting the "dry and scholastic manner," which prevailed in England during the last century, should be supported, if they can be supported, by a reference to facts.—We have often met with similar observations; but have never been so fortunate as to hear them substantiated. We entirely agree with Mr. Milman in the following description of what a sermon ought to be; and all we desire to know is, the names of those writers who are or were in good repute in the Church of England, and who transgressed against these rules.

"The result of the discussion appears to be this, that while it is dangerous to assign to either faculty an excessive or disproportionate share,

it is equally perilous to the successful propagation of religion to omit either. If the dangers attending a predominant attention to the excitement of the imagination and the feelings, without at the same time enlightening the reason, are more evident and appalling, it is because superstition and fanaticism are more obtrusive, more direct and immediate in their evil consequences, than the deadly lethargy of inoperative religion. It is a fearful infringement on the rights of Omnipotence to add the imaginative inventions of men to the pure and simple worship which he has commanded; it is still more so, to supersede the meek and humble spirit of Christianity with the exultations of spiritual pride, the phrensy of bodily excitation, the morose and gloomy temper of the fanatic. But we must not forget, on the other hand, that even the reason must be watched with jealous vigilance. We may argue about religion without being ourselves religious, or making others so. A people *may draw near with their lips*: but that is not all; they must *draw near with their hearts also*. Look to the cold and barren creed of the Socinian; look to the daring spirit of the rationalizing divines of modern Germany, who resolve all the miracles of our Lord into physical facts; and dread the pride of reason as much as the extravagance of the dreaming quietist, or the hallucinations of the frantic enthusiast. God has given to man these faculties of the soul as the inestimable distinctions of his nature: they are at once the pledges and the testimonies of his immortality; neither therefore must refuse its homage, neither decline the invaluable privilege of assisting in the great work of inculcating and enforcing Christian truth."—p. 27.

ART. XVI.—*Thoughts on the Erection of a Chapel of Ease in the parish of Whitwick, addressed to the Inhabitants of that Parish, and particularly to those of the Townships of Thringstone and Swannington.* By the Rev. Francis Merewether, M. A. Vicar of the Parish. 12mo. pp. 45. 3d. Leicester. 1826.

THE spirit in which this letter is written may be perceived from the following extracts:

"Every occasion that serves to remind me of my dear and sacred connexion with you, I consider interesting and important. And if one more momentous than another can possibly arise, it surely must be that of having obtained increased facilities towards joining in the worship of that Church, of which I am a minister. On the approach of such an event, I should blame myself if I did not address to you, in some way or other, the words of affectionate exhortation and counsel. At the same time, since the *numbers* and *extent* of this parish render it difficult to confer with you all in person on this subject; whilst I am likewise anxious that you should be in possession of my sentiments upon it in a *durable* shape; I have adopted the present mode of addressing you, as

the best I can think of, for answering my views and purpose. And as the remarks I am now about to offer to you arise, as I earnestly hope and believe, from a feeling which *ought* to be uppermost in my mind, *viz.* a wish for your souls' good; so I hope you will accept them as such, and read the observations now addressed to you, with "*a meek and quiet* (and teachable) *spirit.*"—p. 4.

"I would ask you :—Does the neglect of the Clergy *now*, or does it not, justify your *present* separation? It will be remembered, that I am now addressing the inhabitants of *my own Parish alone*: consequently, am not called to say any thing respecting my brethren of the Parochial Clergy, whose learning, piety, and professional diligence and faithfulness, (qualifications in which, I believe, the English Clergy are not to be surpassed by those of any Church in Christendom whatsoever,) are far above my vindication and praise. The question, therefore in the present instance, assumes a strictly personal character; and as such, I am not at all disposed to shrink from it. In the sight of God, therefore, and within the sanctuary of your own breasts, I appeal to you solemnly, and ask, whether, either as respects myself, or my valuable and useful curate, you can, in either case, lay neglect to our charge? I will ask farther, can you allege against either or both of us, that we have systematically failed in our endeavours of "*rightly dividing the word of truth?*" that we have "*handled the word of God deceitfully?*" or dealt it forth to our people in unfair or unscriptural proportions? Have we recommended *faith* to the disparagement of *works?* or exhorted to *works*, at the expense of *Christian faith?* Have we so *exalted the grace of God*, as to *discountenance human exertions?* or have we so *elevated the labours of men*, as to *keep out of sight the paramount necessity of Divine aid*, to go before and along with *human endeavours?* On one doctrine indeed, which forms the *other ground* of your separation, *we* and *you* are at issue; but it remains to be shown, on which side Scripture authority lies; and this I shall have to consider presently. Without a single exception, can you bring against us any accusation of *concealing or misrepresenting* any *Christian doctrine or precept*, which, happily, I believe we hold in common? And if you cannot, where, I will ask you in conclusion of this head, where, as far as the ministrations of the clergy are concerned, is your plea for present separation? Especially, too, when the judicious language of our Church, already partially quoted, is added; to which I think you can bring no valid objection; *viz.* that 'although in the visible Church sometimes the evil have chief authority in the ministration of the Word and Sacraments; yet, forasmuch as they do not the same in their own name, but in Christ's, and do minister by his commission and authority, we may use their ministry, both in hearing the Word of God, and in receiving of the Sacraments.'—pp. 15—18.

The effect of this manly and Christian appeal must be advantageous. If it does not diminish the sectarianism which exists in Mr. Merewether's parish, it will prove that the separation is groundless; it will either put an end to a grievous scandal, or remove the burden of it from the Church to the Conventicle.

ART. XVII. *A Sermon preached in the Cathedral Church of St. Paul, on Thursday, May 19, 1825, at the Festival of the Sons of the Clergy.* By the Very Rev. James Henry Monk, D.D. Dean of Peterborough. 4to. pp. 44. 1s. 6d. London, Rivingtons. 1826.

FROM the discourse of this very able and zealous preacher, we extract two passages, with which our readers ought to be acquainted. The first contains a valuable suggestion, which we trust that the friends of the Church will not overlook. The second is a powerful description of a melancholy but important fact.

“ In stating the difficulties to which a large portion of our clerical brethren are necessarily exposed, we must not omit the serious deficiency existing in too many parishes, from the want of suitable dwellings for their ministers. Numerous are the cases where there is to be found on a living no residence house whatever; or such an one as can barely afford shelter for the family of a day labourer. To remedy this evil, by building mansions for incumbents, at the expense of their preferment, a wise and excellent law has been enacted: the provisions of which have proved extensively beneficial in procuring habitations for the residence of the pastor in the bosom of his flock. But to that poorer class of benefices, to which the foregoing remarks principally refer, this enactment of the legislature is scarcely ever applicable. Unless, therefore, some extraneous aid shall interpose, those parishes must still be left without a residence appropriated to their ministers; and all the benefit which results from the abode of an enlightened individual in the midst of the people to whose welfare he is devoted, as a parent to that of his children, must be lost. The want of a habitation in the place where his spiritual duties are allotted, is to the minister an evil of considerable magnitude: but to the community, and to the interests of religion, the injury is far more severe. To secure to every parish in the kingdom a resident minister, no enactments will, I apprehend, be found effectual, until a provision be made for the erection and upholding of Glebe Houses wherever they are wanting. And for such a measure, so essential to the public welfare, as well as to the maintenance of our Apostolical religion, we must look to the public liberality and spirit of this mighty nation. I am well aware how great is the presumption of an humble individual, who ventures to suggest and recommend a plan which can only be realized by the authority and the munificence of the Legislature. But in consideration of the duty this day committed to me, I may, perhaps, be pardoned if, while treating of the causes which lead to the depression of our order and the prejudice of Christ’s Church, I have adverted to measures whereby an evil of great and crying importance might be remedied. At least I must be allowed to offer a humble prayer, that the Almighty may dispose the hearts of our rulers to take the case into their full consideration. Then might we entertain a hope that the present season

of tranquillity and prosperity, with which it has pleased Heaven to bless our country, will not be suffered to pass away without an extension of the public aid to accomplish so desirable a measure. To devote a small portion of the increased resources of the empire in serving the cause of piety and charity, will mark our gratitude for the blessings now vouchsafed to our people, and will moreover give us a better title to hope for their continuance."—p.13.

"The last topic to which I have alluded, is one of a painful import, and such as it would be far more agreeable to my feelings, upon a day consecrated to the cause of Christian charity, to pass over in silence. But in speaking of matters affecting the interests of our Apostolical Church, it is impossible to banish from the mind the hardships and the dangers with which it is at this period encompassed. It is but too well known, that for sometime past, a design has been systematically pursued by various persons, and in different parts of the country, of vilifying and decrying all religion, and particularly of attacking the ecclesiastical Establishment of this land. Respecting the quarter in which these persecuting hostilities against our Church originated, there can be little doubt or uncertainty. They have proceeded from certain public writers; with whom, however, it seems to have been but a secondary object to defame the established Priesthood: this formed only part of a more extensive scheme for producing disaffection to our civil and ecclesiastical constitution. It will be remembered that a very few years ago, when the efforts of these writers were aided by a temporary distress, occasioning discontent in some parts of the community, their progress became alarming to every lover of social order. The political innovators, whose schemes are here alluded to, accompanied them by incessant attacks upon that holy religion, the principles of which they found irreconcilably opposed to their proceedings: and taking advantage of the general diffusion of education among the people, they propagated the poisonous lessons of infidelity, to an extent which the mind cannot contemplate without a feeling of horror. Well aware how impossible it was to excite men to schemes of anarchy and plunder, so long as religion retained its influence over their minds, they began by exhorting them to reject the Christian dispensation as founded in imposture, and by reviling the sacred word of God. It was about this time, and in furtherance of such purposes, that resort was had to the measure of assailing the Ministers of our Church, by every species of misrepresentation, slander, and invective. The real object of these attacks, being confined to publications which are otherwise labouring to propagate unbelief and contempt for religion, is too clear and palpable to require a moment's comment."—p. 19.

"Too many are at all times ready to listen to any report disparaging to men, whose functions invest them with a peculiar title to respect. This unhappy propensity of our nature must have been calculated upon by those writers, who represent the Clergy as hard hearted and rapacious in the exaction of their dues; who search after every instance of misconduct in a Divine, from times past as well as present, and then,

with unconceivable unfairness, advance it as a reflection upon a whole order, the great majority of whom are irreproachable ; and who, finally, represent the riches possessed by the Church of England as enormous in amount ; and by styling them a tax upon the community, excite the cupidity of the multitude to such schemes of spoliation as might destroy the very existence of the Establishment.

“From the last complaint against the Church, little impression can be expected beyond that which a falsehood, confidently asserted, generally produces at the moment. It has led to a strict investigation of the fact, and the result has not only exposed those shameless exaggerations, but has shown that the total endowment of the Clergy is far from exceeding such a moderate provision, as their numbers, and the station in society which they are expected to maintain, render fitting and necessary.”—p. xxi.

ART. XVII.—1. *A Farewell Sermon, preached in the Parish Church of Hodnet, in the County of Salop, April 20, 1823.* By the Rev. Reginald Heber, D.D. Bishop of Calcutta. 8vo. 1s. 6d. Shrewsbury. 1826.

2. *The Omnipresence of God.—A Sermon preached Aug. 5, 1825, on the Consecration of the Church of Secrole, near Benares.* By Reginald, Lord Bishop of Calcutta. 1s. 6d. London, Hatchard and Son. 1826.

3. *The Blessedness of the faithful and wise Steward.—A Funeral Sermon, preached in St. John's Church, Trichinopoly, April 9, 1826, on the Decease of the Right Rev. Reginald, Lord Bishop of Calcutta.* By the Rev. Thomas Robinson, M.A. Domestic Chaplain to his Lordship. 8vo. 1s. 6d. London, Rivingtons. 1826.

4. *A Sermon, preached in the Cathedral Church of St. John, in Calcutta, on Sunday, April 23, 1826, on occasion of the Death of the Right Rev. Reginald, Lord Bishop of Calcutta.* By the Rev. Daniel Corrie, LL.B. Archdeacon of Calcutta. 8vo. 1s. London. 1826.

IN offering these detached pieces to the attention of our readers, it may be proper for us to state, that although we have not heretofore found it consistent with our plan to take notice of single sermons, we hope in future to be able to do so. Of course it is only a summary view that we can afford, excepting on very special occasions, amongst which, this will be readily considered as one ; for the name of Reginald Heber brings with it so many interesting associations and recollections to all who knew him, that it is impossible to treat it as a common theme :

and on the other hand, it is a name so intimately connected, in the public mind, with every thing pious, enlightened, and benevolent, as to exclude all fear that the indulgence of our own feelings will incur reproach.

Of the four sermons placed at the head of this article, the two former were preached by himself, on particular occasions connected with his later life, and the latter, in honour of his memory, by clergymen in India, whose opportunities of knowing him were as ample as their intelligence and integrity are undoubted.

It is with a view to the same object, and in the hope of making his episcopal life more known to his countrymen in England, rather than for the sake of any critical analysis, that we have brought these discourses together; believing that, as far as they go, they will be effectual for the purpose we have in view, and are calculated to throw light upon each other. The former present to us, partially indeed, the character of his mind, as impressed upon his own thoughts and opinions, which occur there; the latter more fully, as it was presented in active life, and viewed and estimated by others; and as he was certainly one of the most natural and unaffected men alive, there is no danger of our being misled by them. Nor must this inquiry be regarded as the mere impulse of personal feeling, offering a vain homage to the dead; for, besides the benefit which we derive from the contemplation of departed worth, in every department of life, (and where shall we find an instance more pregnant with such benefit than this?) there is a high importance attached to the office he lately bore, and to his manner of discharging it, which recommends forcibly this portion of his history to all who are or may be connected with the promotion of Christian knowledge in the same field. It is here that future ministers, of every description, may derive a salutary lesson for their own conduct and guidance, in their difficult and delicate task; for whatever lustre the genius and acquirements of Bishop Heber may have thrown around him, wherever he took his way, we may be certain that he would never have united the suffrages of intelligent men in every class in India, as he did, (of which each new arrival brings us fresh testimony,) if the plain and direct course of his ministry had not been such as sound policy would dictate and experience had approved.

Before, however, we apply ourselves to the topics suggested by these documents, we are desirous of offering one or two observations upon the motives of a choice which has thus eventually deprived Christianity of one of its best and warmest friends, and cast a gloom, not only over his own family, but over our whole literary and Christian world.

When Dr. Heber's acceptance of the Bishopric of Calcutta was finally announced to his friends, the intelligence was received with surprise by all, and with deep regret by many, whose personal feelings were too powerful to be altogether excluded from the question. They saw that a bright career was opened for him at home, combining great usefulness with equal honour, upon which this step would inevitably close the door: and this regret was aggravated to some by the belief, that there were certain points of his character, which, however amiable in themselves, were calculated to prevent that eminent degree of success, which could alone atone for the sacrifice he was to make, and the hazard he was to encounter. It was thought that the simplicity of his taste and manners would be ill suited to a country, where the current of men's minds, running almost uniformly to the acquisition of wealth, naturally attached to pomp and show, and every other mark and symbol of that idol, a degree of importance beyond what they obtain in Europe. And it was farther argued that, notwithstanding all that Dr. Heber had seen and read of human life, there was a prodigality of kindness and confidence in his nature, which must frequently embarrass him in the discharge of an office, where so many conflicting interests would press upon him with their claims, and so many minds of different characters and views were to be studied, conciliated and directed in one channel. That these fears were vain, experience has proved; and, in justice to the memory of the Bishop, we must affirm that no misgiving of this kind ever occurred to himself. A struggle he had, as his friends are well aware, but maintained upon different ground, and, though sharp, decisive. He knew, and had weighed well the various difficulties with which Christianity had to contend in India, and modest and humble as he was, he had studied, anxiously, the quality and bent of his own resources with regard to them. The more he thought of the matter in this light, the more he was convinced that India was the proper field of his Christian labours; and having come to this conclusion, he was determined that no sense of present ease, nor hope of future splendour, should interfere with a conviction, which he regarded as the voice of Heaven speaking to him through his conscience.

"The die is cast, after an anxious and painful deliberation," said one, at that time intimately acquainted with his thoughts; "he cannot refuse to exercise the talents committed to his charge, for God's service, in a field so clearly pointed out to him, and, as his motives for taking it have been of the purest and most conscientious kind, so I trust that God's grace will be poured out upon his exertions, and that this step may not only be pro-

ductive of blessings to many, but may be for his own welfare both here and hereafter."

To cross upon such views as these with advice would have been an offence like that of Peter; Be it far from thee, Lord. And now lamenting bitterly, as we may, his irreparable loss, who can look back upon the bright and benevolent career he ran in India, without acknowledging that this reasoning was amply justified? Who can reflect upon the good he crowded into the brief period of his ministry, the judicious plans he devised and entered upon, the deep and edifying interest he excited through every part of that vast empire; the impulse given by him to the cause of Christianity; the light and grace he has shed upon the Establishment itself; the holy labours amidst which he died, and the prayers and blessings which have followed him, without feeling that the wish of his kind friend has been accomplished; "that the grace of heaven has indeed been poured upon his exertions; that they have been productive of blessings to many; and (shall we hesitate to say?) have added to his own welfare both here and hereafter."

But this theme would carry us too far. It is pleasing, however, to state, from the documents before us, that the simplicity of his mind, contrasted with the variety of his attainments, and regarded with a view to his office, seems to have been the most attractive feature of his character in India; and as for the moral influence he attained and directed, his success, notwithstanding some little difficulties at the first, was so complete as to illustrate a fact of great importance in life; that high qualities are the best means for carrying high purposes into effect, and especially that an enlightened zeal in the cause of Christianity will so certainly carry with it the good wishes and co-operation of the better part of our nature, as to be an ample compensation for the want of that aid, which a deeper knowledge of the selfish views and little passions of others might obtain.

Before we leave this subject, it may be right to correct a very natural mistake into which some of his Indian friends (Mr. Robinson and Sir Charles Grey) have fallen, and which is only of consequence as it affects the character of the sacrifice he made in going out there; viz. that on his return from abroad, he had retired to a country village, where, as Sir Charles Grey expresses it, he had buried in his heart those talents that might have ministered to his vanity in the world, to produce a richer harvest. The truth is, that the Rectory of Hodnet, where he resided, was a family living of great value, (3000*l.* a year,) comprising the estate of his ancestors; several chapelries, of which Hawkstone, the celebrated seat of the Hills, was one; situated in a fine

country; surrounded by an excellent neighbourhood, of which he was indeed the delight and the ornament; and where he frequently conversed with men, who could appreciate and even stimulate his talents.

It was from this place, where he resided almost wholly to the last, and where his mother and sister were settled, and not from Lincoln's Inn, where he resided only a short period of the year, that he was reluctantly called to this appointment. It was here were fixed those ties which it cost him so much to break when he went to India, and it was here he must have been seen and known, to understand the value of the sacrifice he made. It is true, indeed, that he was even then cultivating his talents for a richer harvest. In the enjoyment of society his life was ever studious and contemplative—much of every day was sedulously dedicated to books and to parochial duties; and when he paid his distant visits, he generally went on foot—on which occasions, if you happened to cross upon his path, or greet him on his arrival, you would perceive at once, that he had been conversant with higher thoughts than those which the road presented to him.

We will now pass on to the documents before us. The first is a farewell sermon, delivered upon the eve of his departure for India, to his parishioners at Hodnet, who, having listened to it with many tears, under the hasty but prophetic impression caused by the distance about to separate them, that they should see his face no more, had earnestly entreated to retain amongst them this last lesson of love, (for such indeed it was,) as a memorial of a Pastor, whose character, if they could not wholly appreciate, they knew at least enough of to admire and love. This sermon was printed at Shrewsbury, expressly for his parishioners, and is little known beyond the place where it was preached. It is a warm and unstudied effusion from his pen, very affecting to them at the time, and now interesting to all on several accounts; for while it describes to us incidentally, the character of his intercourse with his parish, it offers many pleasing proofs of the charity and humility which were the leading features of his mind, and of which he left strong traces wherever he went. "Dearly beloved, I beseech you, as strangers and pilgrims, abstain from fleshly lusts, which war against the soul."—1 Peter, ii. 11. In illustrating the Apostle's view, when he addressed his converts as strangers and pilgrims, the following pleasing illustration of life occurs.

"Life bears us on like the stream of a mighty river. Our boat, at first, glides gently down the narrow channel, through the playful murmurings of the little brook, and the windings of its grassy border. The trees shed their blossoms over our young heads; the flowers on the

brink seem to offer themselves to our young hands ; we are happy in hope, and we grasp eagerly at the beauties around us ; but the stream hurries us on, and still our hands are empty.

“ Our course in youth and manhood is along a wider and deeper flood, and amid objects more striking and magnificent. We are animated by the moving picture of enjoyment and industry which passes before us, we are excited by some short-lived success, or depressed and rendered miserable by some equally short-lived disappointment. But our energy and our dependence are both in vain. The stream bears us on, and our joys and our griefs alike are left behind us ; we may be shipwrecked but we cannot anchor ; our voyage may be hastened but it cannot be delayed ; whether rough or smooth, the river hastens towards its home, till the roaring of the ocean is in our ears, and the tossing of his waves is beneath our keel, and the lands lessen from our eyes, and the floods are lifted up around us, and the earth loses sight of us, and we take our last leave of earth and its inhabitants, and of our further voyage there is no witness but the Infinite and Eternal !

“ And do we still take so much anxious thought for the future days, when the days which are gone by have so strangely and uniformly deceived us ? Can we still so set our hearts on the creatures of God, when we find, by sad experience, that the Creator only is permanent ? Or shall we not rather lay aside every weight and every sin which does most easily beset us, and think of ourselves henceforth as wayfaring persons only, who have no abiding inheritance but in the hope of a better world, and to whom even that world would be worse than hopeless, if it were not for our Lord Jesus Christ, and the interest which we have obtained in his mercies ?”—p. 9—11.

He then proceeds to an application which is personal to themselves.

“ But if such are the considerations which (taken as a general truth, and stated in general language) the uncertainty of mortal life is always calculated to awaken in us, more especially have thoughts of this nature been called up in my mind by the near approach of that time when my ministerial labours among you must have an end ; when I must give over, into other hands, the task of watching over your spiritual welfare, and when many, very many, of those with whom I have grown up from childhood, in whose society I have passed my happiest days, and to whom it has been, during more than fifteen years, my duty and my delight (with such ability as God has given me) to preach the Gospel of Christ, must, in all probability, see my face in the flesh no more.

“ Under such circumstances, and connected with many who now hear me by the dearest ties of blood, of friendship, and of gratitude, some mixture of regret is excusable, some degree of sorrow is holy. I cannot, without some anxiety for the future, forsake, for an untried and arduous field of duty, the quiet scenes where, during so much of my past life, I have enjoyed a more than usual share of earthly comfort and prosperity. I cannot bid adieu to those with whose idea almost every recollection of past happiness is connected, without many earnest wishes for their wel-

fare, and (I will confess it) without some severe self-reproach, that, while it was in my power, I have done so much less than I ought to have done to render that welfare eternal.

“There are, indeed, those here who know, and there is One above all who knows better than any of you, how earnestly I have desired the peace and holiness of his church : how truly I have loved the people of this place ; and how warmly I have hoped to be a means in his hands of bringing many among you to glory. But I am at this moment but too painfully sensible that, in many things, yea in all, my performance has fallen short of my principles ; that neither privately nor publicly have I taught you with so much diligence as now seems necessary in my eyes—nor has my example set forth the doctrines in which I have, however imperfectly, instructed you. Yet, if my zeal has failed in steadiness, it has never been wanting in sincerity. I have expressed no conviction which I have not deeply felt ; have preached no doctrine which I have not steadfastly believed : however inconsistent my life, its leading object has been your welfare, and I have hoped and sorrowed, and studied and prayed for your instruction, and that you might be saved. For my labours, such as they were, I have been, indeed, most richly rewarded, in the uniform affection and respect which I have received from my parishioners ; in their regular and increasing attendance in this holy place and at the table of the Lord ; in the welcome which I have never failed to meet in the houses both of rich and of poor ; in the regret (beyond my deserts and beyond my fullest expectations) with which my announced departure has been received by you ; in your expressed and repeated wishes for my welfare, and my return ; in your numerous attendance on the present occasion, and in those marks of emotion which I now witness around me, and in which I am myself well nigh constrained to join.

“For all these accept such thanks as I can pay : accept my best wishes : accept my affectionate regret : accept the continuance of those prayers which I have hitherto offered up for you daily, and in which, whatever and wherever my sphere of duty may hereafter be, my congregation of HODNET shall (believe it !) never be forgotten. But accept, above all, as the best legacy which I can leave behind me, a few plain words of advice, such as are suggested by my text and by the circumstances under which I now address you ; and such as, if duly borne in mind by each of us, will strip our separation of its most painful features, and secure to us, if our faith is true, a more blessed meeting hereafter.”—pp. 12—15.

Then follows his last paternal advice, in which, alluding to some little animosity which probably existed in the parish, he says,

“Would to God, indeed, that I could hope to leave you all as truly at peace with each other, as, I trust and believe, there is peace between myself and you ! Yet, if there be any here whom I have at any time offended, let me entreat his forgiveness, and express the hope that he has already forgiven me. If any who thinks he has done me wrong (I know of none,) let him be assured that the fault, if it were one, is not only forgiven but forgotten. And let me earnestly entreat you all, as it may be the last

request which I shall ever make, the last advice which I shall ever offer to you—Little children, love one another, and forgive one another, even as God, for Christ's sake, hath loved and forgiven you!"—(p. 17.)

When we consider who and what this man was, how praised and distinguished in early life above his fellows; how beloved, admired and esteemed in his maturer years; how high at that very moment in station and in public opinion, and then think of him thus unaffectedly imploring the pardon of the simple farmers and labourers around him, and beseeching their prayers in expressions, not to expire upon the lip, but to be preserved and recorded: it would be difficult to find a more affecting or more genuine picture of humility. Nor can we wonder at the impression left by it in India. Indeed, it was the constant habit of his mind—so meekly did he bear his faculties, and so easily did this grace sit upon him, as to impress upon every one the notion of its being natural; but it is more likely that the same early study of the Bible, which furnished the rich materials for his Palestine, had supplied also the charm which preserved the lowliness of his mind amidst so many trials and temptations calculated to mislead and to inflate it. At all events, we are sure that it was from this source he derived the support of it in his future life. It is not to be imagined, for a moment, that he was insensible to those gifts and graces which Providence had bestowed upon him. This would have rendered him less grateful, and less useful too: *qui se nescit, nescit se uti*; but he knew, that such as he was, he was by the grace of God; and he felt that as his best faculties were derived from, so also should they be dedicated to, that Almighty Power, in the view of whose infinite wisdom, it is not the number of the talents, but the manner of using them, which makes the difference.

Dr. Heber was consecrated Bishop of Calcutta, at Lambeth; not many weeks after this sermon was preached; embarked for his diocese in June, 1823; and arrived there on October 3d of the same year.

After spending a proper time in Calcutta, and its neighbourhood, in the indefatigable discharge of the various duties connected with his cure, and in correspondence and communications respecting the state of the Church, he set out, in June, 1825, to make the visitation of his extensive diocese, which led him first across Central India to Bombay, and occupied, exclusive of Madras, which was not then visited, upwards of sixteen months. It was in the course of this journey, in August, 1825, that he preached the second sermon, at the consecration of the church at Secrole, near Benares, and dedicated it to the civil and military officers of Benares, at whose request it was printed. It contains a popular, but forcible exposition of a few weighty truths, appro-

priate to the scene and the occasion, and suited, as we conceive, to the persons whom he addressed; but beautiful as it is in these respects, and instructive in all, we should do great injustice to Dr. Heber were we to offer it as a fair specimen of his talents or eloquence. It is the sort of matter of which his common conversation was made, and of which his mind was full; and we are certain that it would flow from his pen with the same ease, and almost in the same time as it would have fallen from his lips, and nearly in the same words too. The very structure of the sermon leads to the same conclusion—for it is not a regular discourse in which the preacher explains and enlarges upon some particular verse, and then draws his conclusion, but rather a pleasing and interesting commentary upon the whole passage connected with the text: not that we think it less valuable on this account—but we wish our readers to take it for what it is. The text is a fine verse in Genesis, xxviii. 16, 17.

“And Jacob awaked out of his sleep, and he said, Surely the Lord is in this place, and I knew it not. And he was afraid, and said, How dreadful is this place: this is none other but the House of God, and this is the gate of Heaven.”

Nothing can be more simple and impressive than the opening.

“This was the natural and touching exclamation of the Patriarch Jacob, when, in his lonely and perilous journey from Canaan to the land of the Chaldees, the God of his fathers appeared to him in a dream, to confirm him in his faith and service, and to encourage him in his wanderings, with the assurance of an Unseen and Almighty Protector.

“At that time, an outcast, in some degree, from the tents of his father Isaac, and a fugitive from the anger of a justly offended brother; a forlorn and needy wanderer, he had laid him to sleep on the sands of the wilderness, his head supported on a pillow of stone, and his staff and scrip his only riches. But in his dream he saw Heaven opened, and ‘behold a ladder set upon the earth, and the top of it reached to Heaven; and behold the Angels of God ascending and descending on it. And, behold, the Lord stood above it, and said, I am the Lord, the God of Abraham thy father and the God of Isaac; the land whereon thou liest, to thee will I give it and to thy seed; and thy seed shall be as the dust of the earth, and thou shalt spread abroad to the west, and to the east, and to the north, and to the south; and in thee and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed. And, behold, I am with thee, and will keep thee in all places whither thou goest, and will bring thee again into this land; for I will not leave thee, until I have done that of which I have spoken to thee. And Jacob awaked out of his sleep, and he said, Surely the Lord is in this place, and I knew it not! and he said, How dreadful is this place! this is none other but the house of God, and this is the gate of Heaven.’”—pp. 5—7.

From this passage he draws several inferences.

“Nor is this all. For, secondly, we may learn, from the union which I have noticed as universally observable in Scripture between the promise of worldly blessings and the opportunity of heavenly graces, that the former of these are, in the eyes of the Allwise, only so far valuable as they are means of conducing to the latter; and that whatever wealth, whatever power, whatever personal or mental or worldly advantages, the Most High may in his wisdom extend to us, are not blessings in themselves, but as a way to greater blessedness—as gifts by the use and improvement of which we are required by our God to serve the cause of his Son, and entitle ourselves, (if I may venture to use the expression,) entitle ourselves, through faith, to a more illustrious reward hereafter.

“If the Israelites were endowed beyond the nations of mankind, with wise and righteous laws, with a fertile and almost impregnable territory, with a race of valiant and victorious kings, and a God who (while they kept his ways) was a wall of fire against their enemies round about them; if the kings of the Wilderness did them homage, and the lion banner of David and Solomon was reflected at once from the Mediterranean and the Euphrates; it was, that the way of the Lord might be made known by their means upon earth, and that the saving health of the Messiah might become conspicuous to all nations.

“My brethren, it has pleased the Almighty that the great nation to which we ourselves belong, is a great, a valiant, and understanding nation: it has pleased Him to give us an empire in which the sun never sets, a commerce by which the remotest nations of the earth are become our allies, our tributaries, I had almost said our neighbours, and, by means (when regarded as human means, and distinct from his mysterious providence,) so inadequate as to excite our alarm as well as wonder, the sovereignty over these wide and populous heathen lands.

“But is it for *our* sakes that he has given us these good gifts, and wrought these great marvels in our favour? Are we not rather set up on high in the earth, that we may show forth the light by which we are guided, and be the honoured instruments of diffusing these blessings which we ourselves enjoy, through every land where our will is law, through every tribe where our wisdom is held in reverence, and in every distant isle which our winged vessels visit?

“If we value then (as who does not value?) our renown among mankind; if we exult (as who can help exulting?) in the privileges which the providence of God has conferred on the British nation; if we are thankful (and God forbid we should be otherwise) for the means of usefulness in our power; and if we love (as who does not love?) our native land, its greatness and prosperity; let us see that we, each of us in our station, are promoting to the best of our power, by example, by exertion, by liberality, by the practice of every Christian justice and virtue, the extension of God’s truth among men, and the honour of that holy name whereby we are called.

“There have been realms before as famous as our own, and, (in relation to the then extent and riches of the civilized world,) as powerful and as wealthy, of which the traveller sees nothing now but ruins in the

midst of a wilderness, or where the mariner only finds a rock for fishers to spread their nets.—Nineveh once reigned over the east; but where is Nineveh now? Tyre had once the commerce of the world; but what is become of Tyre? But if the repentance of Nineveh had been persevered in, her towers would have stood to this day. Had the daughter of Tyre brought her gifts to the Temple of God, she would have continued a Queen for ever.”—pp. 13—17.

This passage discloses to us a feature of Bishop Heber’s mind, well known to his friends; very powerful indeed—but softened and directed, as every thing was in him, by Christian piety. We speak of his patriotism—he loved England for the many wise, and great, and good men, she had produced—he loved her for her liberal institutions and laws, and for her many noble, munificent establishments of charity and instruction—he loved too her prosperity and her power: but he loved them chiefly as they were calculated to diffuse the blessings of light, and freedom, and salvation, to the very ends of the earth.

He then proceeds to the third and last lesson, the omnipresence of the Deity—awful, even to good men, but dreadful to the consciences of the wicked.

“It is a dreadful thing, when conscience reckons up her catalogue of secret guilt, to remember that every one of those crimes which were most hateful to God and to man, were done with the knowledge, and in the presence, of the Judge, the severe and upright Judge of men and angels. A dreadful thing it is to know that he, from whom nothing is hidden, while doing, and by whom nothing is forgotten when done, was there in the midst of our foulest lurking-place, in the assembly of our guilty friends and accomplices, his eye bent on our deeds, his anger kindled by our wickedness, and his arm, perhaps, upraised to strike us down to death and hell, if his mercy had not interfered to afford us a little longer time for repentance. A dreadful thing it is to say, surely God was in this place, when I cast my eyes so carefully around and flattered myself that my uncleanness, my robbery, or my fraud, was hid in darkness and solitude. God was in this place, when I deformed his image with drunkenness, and when my mouth was filled with the words of lust and blasphemy. God was in this place, when I called on his holy name, to obtain credit for my falsehood, and challenged his power to punish me if I dealt untruly with my neighbour. And God is in this place, and beholds my present hardness and impenitent heart; he knows and sees my lingering fondness for the sins which I am pretending to abandon; and he is waiting, perhaps even now, for the conduct which I shall now adopt, the resolution which I shall now follow, to determine whether my lot shall be hereafter among the children of light, or whether his Spirit shall be withdrawn from me, (it may be,) for ever.”—(p. 18—20.)

The subject of this passage is a common one, but the handling is that of a master. Nothing can be more impressive and alarming than the manner in which the sense of the divine presence is here enforced upon his hearers. It is a warning, in

which all are more or less interested; for eminently pure and good must that man be, or eminently hardened, who can read it without feeling his mind shrink back upon itself at the remembrance of many an hour, when, regardless that the great eye was upon him, he had been the slave of bad passions, or of vice: without breathing a silent, but heartfelt prayer, to heaven, that in his future life he may be more watchful and more mindful of that awful power, in whom he lives, moves, and has his being.

Finally, he dwells upon the peculiar presence of God in holy places.

In closing our account of these remains of Dr. Heber in India, we are strongly tempted to add a curious and ingenious document, which forms part of the appendix to Mr. Robinson's Sermon, and offers a striking proof of the fertility and variety of his resources. It is a letter drawn up by him in the eastern and apostolic style, and addressed to the new Archbishop, of the Syriac Christians, of St. Thomas, at Travancore, whose history, though generally known, is very interesting. Settled in the Western Shore of the Peninsula, in the very earliest period of the Christian history, the converts of the Apostle Thomas, according to a tradition in St. Jerome, but according to others, of a St. Thomas in the fourth century; they remained for a thousand years in a state of comparative repose, remote from the troubles which afflicted their brethren in Europe, enjoying great political consideration with the princes of the country, and happily exempt from the corruptions of the church of Rome; but excluded also from the light which broke upon Europe at the revival of learning, and deeply tainted with the Nestorian heresy. In this state they were found by the Portuguese, and the Jesuits, at the close of the sixteenth century, who barbarously burnt their ancient books and records, and grafted upon their former heresy the errors of papal superstition. From this yoke, however, the greater part emancipated themselves, when the Portuguese were driven out by the Dutch, and placed themselves under the authority of the Patriarch of Antioch. With the Dutch and English traders, as Mr. Gibbon remarks, they only exchanged persecution for neglect; but this reproach has been long since effectually wiped away. For many years they have been an object of great interest, with all the distinguished English Clergy who have been connected with India. Dr. Buchanan has written a long account of them, Bishop Middleton visited them more than once. Mr. Mill, who has been always much interested in Syrian literature, has frequently communicated with them; and Bishop Heber from the first was exceedingly anxious to show them kindness, and to avail himself of their assistance. It was an opportunity of this kind which gave

occasion to this letter. Mar Athanasius, the person to whom it is addressed, was proceeding from Antioch to take possession of his see at Travancore, the principal seat of the independent Syrian Christians, when he was accidentally put on shore at Bombay, while the Bishop was there on his visitation. To those who are only acquainted with European manners and resources, the situation of the Archbishop at that time will appear scarcely credible. Venerable as his title was, he was not only without provisions for his journey, without staff or scrip; but filled with anxious fears, respecting his reception at Travancore, where he had learnt that a strong and violent party were prepared to oppose the admission of the Syrian stranger. Bishop Heber received him with kindness and respect, acknowledged him publicly in his metropolitan capacity, supplied him with money from funds which were entrusted to him by the Society for propagating the Gospel, and set him on his way rejoicing; and afterwards, to fill up the measure of his kindness, he addressed to him the following primitive letter:

“To the excellent and learned Father Mar Athanasius, Bishop and Metropolitan of all the Churches of Christ in India, which walk after the rule of the Syrians,—Mar Reginald, by the grace of God, Bishop of Calcutta,—Grace, Mercy, and Peace, from God the Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ.

“I have earnestly desired, honoured Brother in the Lord, to hear of thy safe passage from Bombay, and of thy health and welfare in the land of Malabar. I hope that they have rejoiced at thy coming, even as they rejoiced at the coming of Mar Basilus, Mar Gregorius, and Mar Johannes.* And it is my prayer to God, that He who led our Father Abraham the beloved from the land of his nativity, through faith, to a strange and distant country, may in like manner guide, protect, and prosper thee, in health and grace, and every good gift, in the love of thy people, and the spiritual fruit which thou shalt receive of them; as it is written, ‘Commit thy way unto the Lord, and trust in Him: and He shall bring it to pass.’

“Especially, I have been desirous to hear from thee of the good estate of our brethren, the faithful in Malabar, the bishops, presbyters, and deacons; and also of my own children in Christ, the English presbyters who sojourn among you at Cottayam; may God reward you for your love towards them, and may the good will which is between you be daily stablished and strengthened!

“Furthermore, I will you to know, my brother, that the desire of my heart and my prayer to the Lord is, that the holy name of Jesus may be yet further known among all nations; and also, that all who love Him may love one another; to the intent that they which are without,

* The last Syrian Bishops (before Mar Athanasius in 1825) who went to rule the Church in Malabar in 1751; all the Metropolitans after them, (called Mar Dionysius, or Cyrillus, or Philoxenus, severally,) being Indian Bishops of their ordaining.

beholding the unity and peace that is among you, may glorify God also in the day of their visitation. Like as was the desire and prayer of the holy Bishop Thomas Middleton, my honoured predecessor in this ministry; whose memory is blessed among the saints of Christ, whether they be of the English or the Syrian family; not that there are two families, but one, which both in heaven and earth is named after His name who sitteth at the right hand of God, in whom all nations, tribes, and languages, are united and shall be glorified together.

“I also pray thee to write me word how thyself and they that are with thee fare, and how my own children the English presbyters fare, and in what manner of conversation they walk with you. Furthermore, it is my hope, that by God’s blessing, I may be strengthened shortly to pass to Madras, Tranjore, and Trichinopoly, visiting the churches there which belong to my nation: whence my mind is, if God will, to pass on to salute thee, my brother, and the churches under thee, that I may have joy beholding your order, and partaking in your prayers. And if there be any thing more, it may be explained when we meet; for a letter is half an interview, but it is a good time when a man speaketh face to face with his friend.

“This letter is sent by the hand of a learned and godly man, John Doran, one of the presbyters from before me: who purposeth, with thy permission, to sojourn in Cottayam, even as the presbyters, Benjamin Bayley, Joseph Fenn, and Henry Baker, have sojourned until now with license of the godly bishops of the Church of Malabar, to teach learning and piety to all who thirst after instruction, doing good, and offending no man. And I beseech thee, brother, for my sake, and the sake of the Gospel, to receive him as a son, and as a faithful servant of our Lord, who is alone, with the Holy Ghost, most high in the glory of God the Father: to whom be all honour and dominion for ever. Amen.

“Moreover, I beseech thee, brother, to beware of the emissaries of the Bishop of Rome, whose hands have been dipped in the blood of the saints, from whose tyranny our Church in England hath been long freed by the blessing of God, and we hope to continue in that freedom for ever: of whom are they of Goa, Cranganor, and Verapoli, who have in time past done the Indian Church much evil. I pray that those of thy Churches in Malabar,* who are yet subject to these men, may arouse themselves and be delivered from their hands. Howbeit, the Lord desireth not the death of a sinner, but his mercies are over all his works, and He is found of them that sought him not.

“Our brother Abraham, Legate of the Armenian nation, who is sent from his Patriarch at Jerusalem,—may God rescue his holy city from the hands of the Ishmaelites!—who is with us in Calcutta, salutes thee. He also brings a letter which was sent by his hand to thee from the Syrian Patriarch at Jerusalem, and has not found means hitherto of forwarding it to thee at Malabar: and has therefore requested me to send it now to thee. All the Church of Christ that is here salutes thee.

* *i. e.* all Churches of the Syro-chaldaic ritual, one half of which still are under the Romish yoke imposed by the Synod of Diamper. See Geddes and La Croze.

Salute in my name thy brethren Mar Dionysius, and Mar Philoxenus,* with the presbyters and deacons.—We, William Mill and Thomas Robinson, presbyters, that write this epistle in the Lord, salute you.

“The blessing of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, be with you evermore. Amen.

“(Signed in Syriac) REGINALD, BISHOP.

“*By the help of God, let this letter go to the region of Travancore, to the City of Cottayam, and let it be delivered into the hands of the grave and venerable Bishop, Mar Athanasius, Metropolitan of the Church of Malabar.*”

The Bishop left Bombay in the middle of August, and after a short voyage landed at the southern extremity of Ceylon; from which place he went to Colombo, Kandy, &c. With the state of this island, he was exceedingly gratified; but being compelled by many reasons to hasten to Calcutta, he stayed only five weeks there; though he could, as he said himself, have employed himself most agreeably and profitably for as many months.

He arrived at his Indian home, on the Ganges, in October, after an absence of sixteen months. His notes, during the whole of the visitation, but particularly through the north, were very ample, and if, as is not impossible, they should be one day given to the world—we are confident they will be found exceedingly interesting and instructive. In the meantime, we cannot in justice to the cause, withhold the substance of a few cheering observations which he made, as the result of his visitation. Among the white population he found a greater degree of piety and good conduct, than he had reason to expect—while the number of native converts in the Upper Provinces, both pleased and surprised him—particularly he was delighted with the affectionate and grateful manner in which Archdeacon Corrie, who accompanied him in a great part of his visitation, was received by his own converts. Looking, however, mainly to education as the great means of success in the propagation of Christianity, it was grateful to him to perceive, that schools for native children, and half-caste, were generally established at all our stations in the northern and eastern parts of India. Amongst these, several female schools at Calcutta, and in the neighbourhood, had especially attracted his attention; in which, not only the native children of the poorer class, but even of the higher castes, were admitted: and, what was more encouraging, many rich Indians contributed to their support, and were glad to take their servants from them. The surmounting of this obstacle he considered a great victory, particularly as it was achieved without uneasiness; for although their prejudices

* The former governor of the Church, who resigned the chair to the last Mar Dionysius, and now lives in voluntary retirement at Codaungalangary, or Auhur in the North.

as to caste were scrupulously respected, and the Christian religion was not pressed upon them, yet, as they read daily passages from the Bible, they must, he concluded, by degrees, be thus furnished with the means of judging between the two religions, which is all that could be wished. He allowed, however, that conversion was obstructed by great difficulties, and must proceed slowly and cautiously till Providence should be pleased to point out other aids; and he felt too, that it was sometimes involuntarily impeded by the unbridled zeal of sincere, but imprudent friends, which required much judgment, kindness, and temper, to repress.

The island of Ceylon, beautiful and interesting to him in every point of view, was particularly delightful in that which was nearest to his heart. He found Christianity making so great a progress amongst its inhabitants, under the auspices of the clergy now resident, a most excellent and respectable body of men, as to give him reason to hope that along the coast, at least, it would soon be the received religion; especially, as being worshippers of Budh, the prejudices of *caste* were little felt amongst them. The interior of the island, indeed, presented a prospect less favourable, being covered, for the most part, with an impenetrable and unwholesome jungle, and given up to idolatry; but as Sir E. Barnes, the present governor, was indefatigable in making roads, &c., he hoped that this obstacle would be soon removed, and that civilization and Christianity would advance amongst them together.

In the district of Columbo and Galle, alone, the bishop confirmed above three hundred natives, and the Cingabere and Malabar churches were very respectably attended. These were served by two native chaplains, both most exemplary men, and who do infinite good in the island. The Missionaries far surpassed all he had expected; instead of being enthusiastic and ill-judging men, as some reports had led him to suppose, he found them a quiet, steady, industrious body, giving up their whole time to the service of God, and respected and beloved by all who know them, whether black or white.

Female infanticide prevails to a dreadful extent in some of the provinces—in one, the number of women is barely half that of the men.

He had not yet visited Madras and its dependencies; and it was his intention to have set out earlier in the year, which was the proper season; but circumstances over which he had no control, delayed him till the spring.

The following account of his death is extracted from the Calcutta Gazette:—

“On the 14th current, a feeling of grief was spread through every rank of society in Calcutta, by the painful intelligence of the above melancholy event. His Lordship arrived at Trichinopoly on the 1st

instant : on the morning of the 2d he preached, and held a Confirmation in the evening. On the morning of the 3d, he rose at day-break, and attended Divine Service, at the Mission Church, in the Fort ; and on his return home, after visiting Mr. Robinson, his chaplain, who was indisposed, he repaired to dress and bathe. Having remained in the bath longer than usual, his servant entered the apartment, and found his master insensible in the water. Assistance was immediately procured, but every attempt to restore animation was unsuccessful. Upon examination, the vessels of the head were found much distended with blood, and it was the opinion of the medical gentlemen, that the death of his Lordship was occasioned by apoplexy. The Bishop had exhibited unusual heaviness in the morning, when called from his repose, and when undressing for the bath ; and this indisposition, induced in all probability by previous exertion and fatigue, was no doubt rendered fatal by the revulsion occasioned by sudden immersion in a cold bath."—*Calcutta Government Gazette*.

We have involuntarily dwelt so long upon the character of Dr. Heber, as presented to us in his own brief, but interesting memorials, that we have less room for the many testimonies offered by others, to the full development and expansion of his fine qualities in that high station, and vast field, which India presented to him. In adverting to the meetings, held in different Presidencies, on the occasion of his death, we have only to remark, that the speeches made were highly honourable to the feelings, as well as to the talents of those who delivered them ; and that they form altogether, coming from so many persons high in station, but of different professions, not only a valuable testimony to the merits of Bishop Heber, but a powerful incitement and encouragement, to an earnest and conscientious discharge of the same office hereafter. With a view, however, to the object already stated, we prefer to rest chiefly upon Mr. Robinson's Sermons, who, having been his Chaplain and his friend ; the companion of his travels ; the partaker of his labours, and of his counsels ; is certainly most competent to bring us acquainted with his ministerial character and life. His discourse, too, has the merit of being written and preached immediately after his death, and nearly on the spot ; and from the warm and unaffected feeling of sorrow, as well as admiration, expressed in it, we might venture to infer, as the Jews from our Saviour's tears, over the grave of Lazarus ; " See, how he loved him."

The text is from Luke, xii. 42, 43, 44.

" Who then is that faithful and wise steward whom his Lord shall make ruler over his household, to give them their portion of meat in due season ? Blessed is that servant, whom his Lord, when he cometh, shall find so doing. Of a truth I say unto you, that he will make him ruler over all that he hath."

After a few prefatory observations, he thus describes the conduct of the Bishop in India.

“ Little more than two years have elapsed since he first arrived in India, but in that short period he had visited almost every station where a Christian Church could be assembled ; and, while engaged in the longest and most difficult duties of any Bishop, since the earlier ages of Christianity, he employed himself, wherever he came, not only in the higher functions of his office, but in the more humble and laborious duties of an ordinary pastor. He had thus become known to all his clergy, and to all his people, in the plains and mountains of Hindostan, in the wilder tracts of Central India, in the stations of Guzerat, the Deckan, and the western coast ; in the hills and valleys of Ceylon ; and in these southern provinces, the scene of his latest labours, and henceforth of his dearest memory.

“ In the course of these journeys, and in all his other labours, his heart was most earnestly and intently fixed, not only on the government of the existing Church, but on the extension of Christ's kingdom in these strong holds of heathen and Mahomedan superstition. He delighted to consider himself as the chief missionary of India, a character implied, in his judgment, in the nature of his episcopal office itself : and while he felt it to be his bounden duty to confine his pecuniary aid and direct influence to the establishments of that Church, whose orders and ministry he received as apostolical, yet most sincerely did he rejoice in the successful labours of all Christian Societies of whatever denomination, in the field of India ; for he felt, that, while marshalled against a common enemy, there should be none other than a generous rivalry, and a brotherly emulation between our separate hosts ; and, that even thus the fortune of the field is best secured, if each army keeps its own ranks unbroken, and its own discipline inviolate. The several Societies connected with our Church partook largely of his regard and active support ; particularly the venerable chartered Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, whose general cause, as connected with their central establishment of Bishop's College, he had successfully pleaded at the several Presidencies of Bombay, Colombo, and Calcutta ; and which he purposed, on his return from Madras, to recommend there also to the benevolence of the Christian world :—the Church Missionary Society, to whose labours, and the character of their missionaries, he repeatedly bore the most honourable testimony : and the venerable Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, whose interests literally occupied his dying thoughts.

“ The missions of this last-named Society, at Tanjore and in this place, the foundations of the apostolic Schwartz and the apostolic men who have walked and are still walking in his steps, awakened, in a most powerful degree, and beyond any thing he had previously seen, the affections of his heart ; and to devise and arrange a plan for their revived and more extended prosperity, was the object which occupied for many days, and to the last hour of his life (as several who now hear me can bear witness), his anxious thoughts, his earnest prayers, and the concentrated energies of his mind. Again and again did he repeat to

me, that all which he had witnessed in the native congregations of these missions,—their numbers, their general order, their devout attendance on the services of the Church, exceeded every expectation he had formed; and that in their support and revival he saw the fairest hope of extending the Church of Christ. Never shall I forget the warm expressions of his delight, when, on Easter-day, he gathered them around him as his children, as one family with ourselves, administered to them the body and blood of our common Saviour, and blest them in their native tongue: and when, in the evening of that day, he had seen before him not less than 1300 natives of those districts, rescued from idolatry and superstition, and joining, as with one heart and voice, in the prayers and praises of our Church,—I can never forget his exclamation, that he would gladly purchase that day with years of life.

“Those of you who heard his parting address on the succeeding day, from the grave of Schwartz, will never lose the deep impression of that solemn moment, when (as if he had foreseen that his departure was at hand) he commended you to God and to the word of his grace, charging you by the love of your Saviour and of each other, and animating you by the memory of your departed Father, and by the near prospect of your eternal reward, to perseverance, fidelity, and Christian order. Of his last public ministrations in this place, I need not speak to you; the memory of them is fresh in every heart; you treasure them as the last words of a departed friend. You remember well the earnestness and affection of his manner, how *he exhorted, and comforted, and charged every one of you, as a father doth his children, that ye would walk worthy of God who hath called you to his kingdom and glory.* Alas! who could have foreseen, while hanging on those lips, that they would so soon be closed in death; that the voice of your shepherd, whom you had just begun to love, should be heard by you again no more for ever! His sun was in its meridian power; and its warmth most genial, when it was suddenly eclipsed for ever. He fell, as the standard-bearer of the cross should ever wish to fall, by no lingering delay, but in the firmness and vigour of his age, and in the very act of combat and of triumph. His master came suddenly, and found him faithful in his charge, and waiting for His appearing. His last hour was spent in his Lord’s service, and in ministering to the humblest of his flock. He had scarcely put off the sacred robes with which he served at the altar of his God on earth, when he was suddenly admitted to his sanctuary on high, and clothed with the garments of immortality.

“What mean then these tears for his removal? and why mourn we for our departed father as men without hope? He was that faithful and wise steward, whom his Lord had made ruler over his household, to give them their portion of meat in due season. And Oh, blessed! eternally blessed, *‘is that servant whom his Lord when he came found so doing!’* He has exchanged a life of labour, and anxiety, and imperfection, for the repose and blessedness of heaven. His warfare is accomplished; and he has passed from the conflicts of the church on earth to the glories of an everlasting triumph.”—pp. 22—27.

We would gladly extract largely from Mr. Corrie’s sermon,

preached at the cathedral church of Calcutta, if we were not afraid to trespass upon the time of our readers by any thing which might appear like repetition. We cannot refrain, however, from one or two short passages. The first shows the sense entertained of the importance of episcopacy in India among the clergy, and of the effects already produced by it.

“ In this country the members of our Church were long left without any semblance of discipline ; but of late years we have enjoyed a superintendence approaching near to the scripture model on that head : it has been a rule of superior knowledge, of superior activity, piety, and love. Much good arose to many from the labours of individual ministers in this place, in former days ; but how much more of *general* benefit has arisen to our community since the establishment of Episcopal Government among us !

“ But as, under the Mosaic Dispensation, the High Priests were not allowed to remain by reason of death, so have we with peculiar emphasis experienced in this our Zion. How are we instructed by the sudden removal of our ecclesiastical ruler !—‘ O put not your trust in princes, nor in any child of man ; for there is no help in them !’ To him who, in a certain and most important sense, is the alone Shepherd and Bishop of His Church, must our expectations be directed, and our prayers offered up, that in judgment He would remember mercy, and raise up to us a successor of a similar spirit—one who, like him whose loss we deplore, will feed the flock with understanding, and rule them faithfully with all his power.”—pp. 9, 10.

The second is produced for the purpose of exhibiting, in combination with an extract from Sir Chas. Grey’s Speech, a remarkable feature of Dr. Heber’s mind, his firm devotion to the great object of his office ; and how little either the disappointments or vexations on the one hand, or the indulgence of his own cultivated taste and conversation on the other, were able to divert him from the cheerful prosecution of it.

“ The spirit of of St. Paul, in those words to the Romans, appears in a remarkable degree to have animated him—‘ I am a debtor both to the Greeks and to the Barbarians, both to the wise and to the unwise. So, as much as in me is, I am ready to preach the gospel to you that are at Rome also. For I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ : for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth :’ Rom. i. 14—16. With this devotion to his object, what a mild, forbearing, and gentle spirit—what tenderness, affection, and persevering self-command—were united !”—pp. 13, 14.

Again,

“ Our greatly beloved Bishop was not without those trials which are common to man : but, in respect of whatever personal inconvenience might lie in the way of the line of duty which he had prescribed for himself, his language was, ‘ None of these things move me.’ ”—p. 16.

Compare this with Sir Charles Grey's Speech.

“ To this large assemblage I fear I might appeal in vain, if I were to ask, that *he* should step forward, who had never felt his spirit to sink when he thought of his native home, and felt that a portion of his heart was in a distant land : who had never been irritated by the annoyance, or embittered by the disappointment of India. I feel shame to say, that *I* am not the man who could answer the appeal. The Bishop was the only one, whom I have ever known, who was entirely master of these feelings. Disappointments and annoyances came to him as they come to all ; but he met and overcame them with a smile ; and when he has known a different effect produced on others, it was his usual wish that ‘ they were but as happy as himself.’ Connected with this alacrity of spirit, and in some degree springing out of it, was his activity. I apprehend that few persons, civil or military, have undergone as much labour, traversed as much country, seen and regulated so much, as he had done, in the small portion of time which had elapsed since he entered on his office ; and if death had not broken his career, his friends know that he contemplated no relaxation of exertions. But this was not a mere restless activity or result of temperament : it was united with a fervent zeal, not fiery nor ostentatious, but steady and composed ; which none could appreciate, but those who intimately knew him. I was struck myself, upon the renewal of our acquaintance, by nothing so much as the observation, that though he talked with animation on all subjects, there was nothing on which his intellect was bent, no prospect on which his imagination dwelt, no thought which occupied habitually his vacant moments, but the furtherance of that great design of which he had been made the principal instrument in this country. Of the same unobtrusive character was the piety which filled his heart : it is seldom that of so much there is so little ostentation. All here knew his good-natured and unpretending manner : but I have seen unequivocal testimonies, both before and since his death, that under that cheerful and gay aspect there were feelings of serious and unremitting devotion, of perfect resignation, of tender kindness for all mankind, which would have done honour to a saint. When to these qualities you add his desire to conciliate, which had everywhere won all hearts—his amiable demeanour, which invited a friendship that was confirmed by the innocence and purity of his manners, which bore the most scrutinizing and severe examination—you will readily admit that there was in him a rare assemblage of all that deserves esteem and admiration.”—pp. 30, 31.

We cannot close our notice of this amiable, learned, and excellent man, without casting an anxious thought towards the state of those vast spiritual interests in India, over which he so lately presided, and more especially of that venerable office in the discharge of which he died. It is now nearly eleven years since the experiment (for such it has hitherto been) was commenced, and whether we look to the simple facts, as they appear in the history

of the period, or to the opinions which persons in India most capable of judging rightly have formed respecting them, there are two conclusions which we have a right to draw. 1st. That the administration of our religion by bishops, has been productive of great advantage to the Christian cause, in whatever view it be regarded; and 2d. That this advantage has only fallen short of our fair and legitimate expectations, in consequence of the narrow scale upon which the experiment has been made. The first of these propositions has been affirmed, directly or indirectly, by many, and contradicted by none; the second, we think, is equally evident. That the burthen of the Episcopal office in India would be too heavy for the shoulders of a single man, might have been naturally conjectured by any one, who would only have cast a glance at the immense extent of our possessions in India, and considered the distances by which the presidencies are separated from each other, the difficulties of the land journeys, and the nature of the climate in all. But had he reflected further upon the various views, characters, and connections of the clergy themselves, whom it was the duty of the Bishop to superintend, the many new relations to be formed and supported with the Company and its officers, and above all, the wants of an immense mass of heathen population coming in contact with him on every side, we do not see how this conclusion could have been resisted. Unhappily, it is now no longer matter of speculation;—two costly victims have been already offered;—and if the system should be continued as it is, we seem driven to the alternative, either that the office itself must fall into disrepute by being negligently administered, or being confided to more generous spirits, must again bear them down, one by one, overwhelming their families with grief, and leaving dark and dreary intervals between.

Bishop Middleton, to whom was committed the arduous task of clearing the ground, laying the foundation, and adjusting the various parts of the Episcopal edifice, amongst strangers not always well disposed towards the work, was a man of great vigour, mental and bodily; and having survived this labour, which he executed with great industry and ability, and being inured to the climate, it might have been imagined, that he was perfectly competent to the discharge of the ordinary duties of the office; and yet, in so many years, he was never able to effect a complete visitation of his diocese, and not long before his death, he declared solemnly to Mr. Trant, his conviction, which he wished to be communicated for the benefit of others, that he was fast sinking under the weight of a heavy burthen to which his constitution was unequal. The career of Dr. Heber was terminated much more abruptly; and although from the natural buoyancy of his mind

and the excitements under which he lived, he seems to have been insensible to the effects of his own incessant labour in such a climate,* there was one who watched with an anxious eye over his welfare, from whom it could not be concealed, that before the attack which proved fatal to him, he was so much altered and reduced in appearance as to excite serious apprehensions in his behalf. Under a very natural impression produced by these facts, the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge, at a very full meeting, the Archbishop of Canterbury in the chair, agreed to the following Memorial, which contains, as we conceive, all that can be said most urgent upon the question.

MEMORIAL

To the Honourable Court of Directors of the East India Company.

The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, having assembled in a Special General Meeting, for the purpose of testifying its respect for the memory of the late deeply lamented Bishop of Calcutta, adverts with feelings of the most painful recollection to the short period which has elapsed since it was called upon to pay the like tribute to the memory of his illustrious predecessor; and considers it a paramount duty humbly and earnestly to represent to the Honourable Court of Directors of the East India Company the necessity for an enlarged Ecclesiastical Establishment in the East.

The Society returns its grateful thanks for the protection and assistance which it has uniformly experienced from your Honourable Court, in aid of its various endeavours to promote Christian knowledge in the East: and it cordially joins in the general acknowledgement of the important benefits that have arisen from the introduction of episcopal authority, and for an increased provision for the spiritual wants of the British inhabitants of India. But, at the same time, so many inconveniences have arisen from the attempt to govern the Indian church by a single Prelate, that the Society ventures to declare its conviction, too fatally confirmed by the past, that no individual, however endowed with bodily and mental vigour, can be sufficient for the exertions rendered necessary by the overwhelming magnitude of the diocese of Calcutta.

A visitation of that diocese cannot be accomplished without traversing the whole of India, and undertaking long voyages by sea, nor consequently without a greater exposure to perilous varieties of climate, than is required of any civil officer in the East. So great indeed is the difficulty of this duty, that Bishop Middleton, although his life was spared for nine years, died before he could complete it; and Bishop Heber sank under the labour of his primary visitation. And it is the opinion of the Society, that nothing but the division of the diocese of Calcutta can prevent a continual sacrifice of valuable lives, and a perpetually recurring

* It is not generally known that he was in so much danger in Guzerat, as to write letters to his mother and sister under the strong impression of impending death.

interruption of the great work for the performance of which that Episcopal Establishment was formed.

The Society would also respectfully suggest to your Honourable Court that, as the constitution of the Government in India is constructed upon the principle of a separate administration at each of the three Presidencies, it must necessarily be inconvenient not to assimilate the government of the Church to that system which experience has proved to be so beneficial in the civil, judicial, and military departments. Such a measure would prevent the suspension of business, now occasioned by the long and frequent absence of the head of the Church from the seat of the supreme Government, and by the immense distance to which he is carried in the course of his visitation.

The Society further begs leave to represent to your Honourable Court the peculiar bad effect of the interruptions which occur under the present system, upon various Institutions for promoting Christian knowledge.

The Protestant Missions in Southern India, so long under the care of this Society, received the greatest benefit from the personal superintendence of Bishop Middleton. But he was only enabled to visit them once; and ten years elapsed between that event and the primary visitation of Bishop Heber. And now these Missions, of which Bishop Heber, after having been a witness to their effects, often emphatically said, "that the strength of the Christian cause in India was *there*," and which were beginning to derive the most important advantages from his presence, are once more deprived of the privilege of being governed by a Prelate personally acquainted with their condition.

Bishop's College in Calcutta, also, which promises to become the chief source of Missionary exertions in India, was struggling with the difficulties inseparable from infancy, when it lost the support of its founder Bishop Middleton. His successor had little opportunity of displaying that zeal for its welfare which increased in his mind as he became more fully acquainted with its value; and it is to be feared, that another obstacle to its progress has been raised up by the death of its second visitor.

If it be supposed, that in these and similar cases the Archdeacons might supply the place of Episcopal superintendence, it must be remembered that those officers can never exercise the peculiar functions of a Bishop, nor can their services be effective unless the officers themselves enjoy opportunities of frequent personal communication with their Diocesan—while in India, such communication is prevented by the wide distance of some of the Archdeacons from Calcutta, and is entirely suspended during the vacancy of the See.

The Society, therefore, humbly trust, that your Honourable Court, taking these circumstances into its favourable consideration, and advertising, at the same time, to the fact, that since the erection of the See at Calcutta, the British dominions in India have been greatly augmented, the Chaplains on the Honourable East India Company's establishment nearly doubled, ample provision made for the encouragement of Mahomedan and Hindoo learning, education freely offered to natives of all classes, and Missionary establishments, in connection with the Church of England, instituted at each Presidency, will be pleased to take such measures as your Honourable Court in its wisdom may deem fit, for

promoting the erection of additional Sees at the Presidencies of Madras and Bombay.

The Society hopes, that it may be justified for thus strongly urging the prayer of its memorial. The subject has been pressed upon its notice from various quarters—and it considers itself only as expressing the opinion of all those whose attention has been turned to the promotion of Christian knowledge in the East.

Admitting the validity of this reasoning, the subject seems to resolve itself into this question, whether the continuance of Episcopacy in India affords a prospect of advantage commensurate with the increased expense of that more extensive and effective support of it which is necessary to its welfare.

In considering this question, the first thing which presents itself is the household of faith, our own countrymen in India. And here, we see no reason why India, extended and aggrandized as she is at present, and absorbing so large a portion of our population, civil and military, should be deprived of the tried advantage confessedly arising in England, from the blending of religious persons and influence, through all the mass of society and in every rank of life. Hitherto, perhaps, the state of things might not have been ripe for it: but now, as every presidency in India has its aristocracy, consisting of judges and generals, and members of council, and counsellors high in the law, is it not right that there should be a bishop and an archdeacon in every presidency too—to keep alive and to cherish the vast concerns of eternity, amidst the suggestions of ambition, interest and pleasure, which always clamor to be heard? How much has been already effected in this way, may be clearly discovered from the speeches at the public meetings in honour of Dr. Heber's memory. Nor can we hesitate to believe that this salutary movement will be always much more easily propagated in the classes below, if it be found to receive a strong impulse from those above. And where, let it be asked, will be found, in the whole range of British power, a body of men to whom the consolations and the warnings of Christianity are more valuable and more necessary than to our countrymen in India? To those who are hastening to be rich, of whom the great body of our Indian population is composed, how essential is the frequent and impressive warning, that they are likely to fall into a temptation and a snare!—while to the disappointed, the sorrowful, and the sick, of which too, we fear, there is a considerable number, what balm so sweet and consoling as that which the prospects of Christianity lay open? Besides, we know how effectual are external forms, and even names, in supporting internal piety, and how little indeed they are good for else; and upon this principle, we conceive, it will be no mean advantage, that both

the youth who go out to India, and the men of mature age who return from it to England, will find on their arrival, not only the same services to resort to, but the same offices and dignities which they have before been accustomed to revere.

Another advantage likely to be attained by the establishment of Episcopacy upon a more efficient and extensive plan in India, will be a nearer approach to unity of doctrine and discipline amongst the clergy of the Establishment, than it has hitherto been possible to attain, on account of the different sources from which they have been sent out, and the different authorities on which they depend. This is a want of high and growing importance, nor do we see any effective remedy but the superintendence of several enlightened men of acknowledged merit and of the highest authority, actuated by common principles and looking to the same end, but each the centre of a system, in which every part below may be near enough to profit by his influence. Under such auspices we do not anticipate any serious difficulty in preserving this desirable understanding; for if there be a region in the world where an enlarged charity is more practicable and more necessary than any other, it must surely be India, where a common cause, involving the fundamentals of Christianity, furnishes a bond and a motive of union not to be found elsewhere: a cause which should not only induce the clergy of our own Church to lower the standard of their petty differences, but of power enough to bring over the sectaries who dissent from us, to range themselves under the common banner of our National Church.

And this brings us to the consideration of another part of the subject, mainly depending upon a more effective Episcopacy in India, and which cannot be excluded from the question, viz. The spiritual wants of the native population.

However low may be the opinion entertained by some persons in this or in that hemisphere respecting the degree of success likely to attend even our best-directed efforts in the conversion of the Hindoos, it would be base and shameful to abandon it when so many new prospects seem rising to our hopes. It is quite impossible that men of any class, rightly imbued with Christian principles, can be indifferent to the state of so many millions of their fellow-creatures and fellow-subjects, not only involved in the grossest superstition and idolatry, but under the influence of a religion confessedly hostile in its doctrines and ordinances to all moral and political improvement: least of all can the clergy be excused for despairing of such a cause. They cannot be regardless of their great Master's solemn injunction, "Go ye, and teach all nations;" they cannot cease from plying that holy work in which their predecessors have so long laboured even with joy: whatever be their quality, denomination, or opi-

nions, by whomsoever delegated or paid, they have a commission from a common Master, who is above all, which they cannot forego: nor need they to lose sight of it for a single moment, for while they are endeavouring earnestly to inculcate by their preaching and example the genuine fruits of Christianity upon their flocks, they may comfort themselves with the thought, that they are contributing to remove that worst obstacle to the propagation of the Christian faith, the bad lives of its professors. "Who knows," says the venerable Schwartz, after labouring nearly fifty years in the vineyard, "but God may remove some of the great obstacles to the propagation of the Gospel. Should a reformation take place among the Europeans, it would be the greatest blessing to the country."

But deeply impressed as we are with the necessity and duty of continuing these exertions, and confident, in God's good time, of their final triumph, we are perfectly aware how much, both of the success and of the credit of our cause, will depend upon the spirit with which it is undertaken, and the instruments by which it is carried on. And, happily, upon this point intelligent men of all parties seem to be agreed.

It is admitted by Sir John Malcolm, an author of the highest reputation, while he deprecates all interference of government, that there are two safe and legitimate channels for the diffusing of Christianity in that country, viz. the labours of missionaries and the extension of general knowledge; and this statement we consider in all its parts as calculated to throw great light upon the whole argument before us. The channels pointed out in it are precisely those to which the Church of England has always directed its chief attention, and on which she now relies; and while, on the one hand, it shows the great value of the missionaries and the attention which is due to them, it indicates no less, on the other, the necessity of an enlightened superintendence by persons of acknowledged authority, to give harmony and consistency to their labour, and to repress the ardour of unbridled zeal, whenever it may occur. Under this view of the matter, we can understand well what Bishop Heber meant, when Mr. Robinson describes him as saying, that he desired to be considered as the chief of the missionaries in India.

Again—"The Church of India should rise," says the eloquent eulogist of Bishop Heber, "in quietness and beauty, like that new Temple described by himself in his 'Palestine,' in the erection of which—

'No hammer fell, no ponderous axes rung;
Like some tall palm the mystic fabric sprung.'

For this purpose it should be founded in wisdom and peace, strengthened by candour, kindness, and charity; and while the

light of education and civilization should be constantly thrown around it, no discord should reign within its walls, nor violence proceed from its border.

These are, in truth, the arts which the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge has constantly impressed upon its missionaries on their departure for India;* these are the arts by which the admirable Schwartz, and those who followed in his steps, acquired the confidence of the native powers and smoothed the way for that extension of the Church in Tanjore, which caused Bishop Heber to exclaim, that *there* was the strength of the Christian cause in India; these, in fine, are the arts by which Dr. Heber himself obtained the affection and co-operation of all intelligent and influential men in India; and by these too must every one be imbued who hopes to support and to propagate effectually the same holy cause.

But to complete this noble work, Sir Charles Grey states, in the close of his speech, that many hands and many spirits like Bishop Heber's must be engaged; and it is precisely this union which the present measure is calculated to obtain. We wish for several spirits like his, constituting a permanent body in India, not again to be dissolved by a single blow, but constantly and regularly, by their authority, influence, and example, guiding the many hands below them in the same earnest but peaceful course of duty. Such spirits indeed, he says, are rarely to be found, and on this account he considers the loss as irreparable. We would not yield to this distinguished man in his opinion of Dr. Heber, whom we have known intimately for many years; we believe that a mind more pure from earthly dross, more variously and richly gifted and adorned, more nicely balanced and more sweetly tempered and attuned, is scarcely to be found on British ground; but it would be an injury to our Establishment to deny, that there are many persons in its body able and willing to pursue successfully the same course. Charity, humility, earnestness, and piety, are the genuine fruits of our religion; add to these knowledge, and you have all that is required; and if our Established Church, fed and strengthened as she is by our schools and colleges, and backed by our national endowments and civil privileges, should be unable to furnish both a present supply and a succession of such enlightened men, she would but ill fulfil the duties which these advantages impose upon her. On this account it is that we claim this distinction for her, not as a privilege to enjoy, but as a cross and a burthen to bear—not as a station for learned ease to repose on, or in which cupidity may realize her dreams—but as a painful pre-eminence, for which ignorance and

* See the Collection of Speeches to the Missionaries, collected by Archdeacon Pott, particularly an admirable address of Bishop Middleton.

indolence are alike unfit, and to which none but the sincere and the earnest would aspire.

Guided by such principles, we are inclined to hope that the propagation of the Christian faith in India, so far from being a source of disquietude to the government, will recommend itself to their gratitude, as conducive to their best and soundest policy. And this conviction has been much more strongly impressed upon us, by a fact lately offered to our notice, under circumstances of singular weight and authority. There are four writers,* whose opinions are now before the public, upon the government of India: all men of great ability, and lately holding high situations in the service; (amongst them Sir John Malcolm and Lieut.-Colonel Stewart;) and though they differ very materially from each other upon other points, they all agree in this most important one:—viz. the necessity of admitting natives to situations of higher trust and emolument than they are now capable of enjoying. We presume not to estimate the difficulties which must await the different steps of this process, or the several cautions and remedies which may be suggested to prevent or to remove them; but we are convinced, that from the latter, the Christian religion neither can nor ought to be excluded. It is notorious, that the religious creed of the Mahometan, and especially that of the Hindoo, is not merely a speculative faith. It enters largely into their principles of morals—the rights of their fellow creatures, and the usages of common life; and it must enter too into their counsels and conduct when in power, unless their prejudices and bigotry can be softened by better lights gradually let into their minds, in proportion as they are admitted to higher degrees of trust, or counteracted by the growth of some other powerful principle, on the part of the ruling nation, we do not see how this union can be either stable or secure. To both these desirable ends, Christianity, if rightly administered and respected, must essentially contribute: and on this account, as well as others, we deem it to be the duty of the government to establish it upon a solid and extensive basis—to give honour and respect to its services and its ministers, and to encourage the diffusion of its doctrines and precepts by every means which may be consistent with policy and good faith. Sir Thomas Monro, we hear, has openly declared, that a few such men as Bishop Heber would add great strength to the government of India. And what was the life of Bishop Heber but a beautiful exhibition of the Christian Faith!

We think it dangerous in this country to admit Catholics to a participation of political power; but what are the differences between Catholics and Protestants, acknowledging one God and Saviour and one code of morals, when compared with those pow-

* See the *Quarterly Review*, Dec. 1826.

erful elements of disunion which separate the Hindoo and the Mahometan from the Christian.

But, finally, in estimating the cost of this arrangement, there is another point of view in which the question will force itself upon our attention, and which, though in some respects humiliating, is not without its portion of encouragement. Even to those who are disposed to look with the most favourable eye upon the history of our policy in India, it must, we think, appear that, in the course of so many struggles, conquests, and revolutions, in which the stern plea of necessity has been often urged, and the grasping spirit of avarice or ambition has been at hand to profit by it, there is much for us to regret towards that numerous and ancient people, and much to expiate; and though it may be true, considering the wild and arbitrary character of its various native dynasties, that our interference may have rescued them from severer ills, and have given to their population a security of life and property, which they could not otherwise have obtained, yet it will not be denied that the protection we have afforded has been often most expensive and onerous to them. Under this impression it must, we think, be the ardent wish and prayer of every patriotic Christian, that the work of expiation may be carried on, not by like evils, inflicted upon us, but by new benefits conferred upon them, of which we may be the instruments; and as we believe in our hearts, that of all the blessings placed by Providence in our power, there is none so gracious in the sight of heaven, so precious to mankind, as the gift of the Christian religion; we are bound upon this principle, nationally and individually, to concur in every wise plan calculated to promote it. Of such a nature we have shown the establishment of Episcopacy to be; and if the Church of England do not shrink (as shrink she will not) from meeting cheerfully the burthen that devolves upon her, neither ought the Government and the Company to be deterred by the expense of it. And since it must animate us to perceive that this process of expiation has already commenced, we wish to direct the attention of our readers to a passage in Mr. Burke's Speech on Mr. Fox's East India Bill, descriptive of our relations with India in 1784. The colouring is high, but the features were there.

“Animated,” says he, speaking of the civil servants that went out to India, “with all the avarice of age, and all the impetuosity of youth, they roll in one after another, wave after wave, and there is nothing before the eyes of the natives but an endless, hopeless prospect of new flights of birds of prey and passage, with appetites continually renewing for a food that is continually wasting. With us are no retributory superstitions, by which a foundation of charity compensates, through ages, to

the poor, for the rapine and injustice of a day. With us no pride erects stately monuments which repair the mischiefs which pride had produced, and which adorn a country out of its own spoils. England has erected no churches, no hospitals, no palaces, no schools;—England has made no bridges, made no high-roads, cut no navigations, dug out no reservoirs. Every other conqueror of every other description has left some monument, either of state or beneficence, behind him. Were we to be driven out of India this day, nothing would remain to tell that it had been possessed, during the inglorious period of our dominion, by any thing better than the ourang-outang or the tiger.”

When we have reflected upon the features of this startling picture, and compared it with that which the same relations exhibit at the present day, what a wonderful and delightful alteration will appear! how many of its worst features have been expunged or altered, how greatly the harshness even of those which remain, has been softened! It is not for us to speak of the superior education and enlarged views of those who now hold office in India, the palaces that have been built, the bridges, the roads, and the reservoirs which have been formed, but we can point to the churches which have been reared, the schools which have been endowed, and, what it never entered into the imagination of Mr. Burke to conceive, the College which has lately arisen on the banks of the Ganges, entirely for missionary purposes and for Indian conversions; and all this too by funds not wrung hardly from the impure sources of pride or superstition, but chiefly the spontaneous offering of Christian charity, collected in pounds and shillings from the people of this country. It is in the fervent hope that all these may be multiplied and extended, and usefully directed, that we advocate this cause; and if it should be the will of Heaven that the British power should one day be expelled from India, we trust that, among other monuments of state or benevolence, indicating the characters of those who had reigned in it, there will always be found in the wide diffusion of the Christian name, and in the calm operation of the Christian precepts, the imperishable traces of many a holy and venerable man, of whom, like Bishop Heber, it may be said, “how beautiful are the feet of those which bring glad tidings of good peace.”

* * * *We have been prevented from inserting a Report of Law Proceedings relative to the Church in the present Number, but it will be given in the next.*

STATE OF THE DIOCESES IN ENGLAND AND WALES,

FROM OCTOBER TO DECEMBER, INCLUSIVE.

CANTERBURY.

PREFERRED.

The Rev. T. Wood to the Vicarage of Ashford; Patrons, the Dean and Chapter of Rochester.

The Rev. William Bennett, Rector of St. George's, Canterbury, to the Vicarage of Milton, Kent; Patrons, the Dean and Chapter of Canterbury.

MARRIED.

At Folkestone, Wyndham Knatchbull, D.D. late Fellow of All Souls' College and Laudian Professor of Arabic in the University of Oxford, and Rector of Smeeth with Adlington, in Kent, to Anna Maria Elizabeth, eldest daughter of Henry Dawkins, Esq.

DECEASED.

At the Vicarage of Milton, the Rev. John Yeates.

The Rev. James Bond, 52 years Vicar of Ashford, Kent.

YORK.

PREFERRED.

The Rev. Henry Venn, M.A. Fellow of Queen's College, Cambridge, to the perpetual Curacy of Drypool, near Hull; Patron, W. Wilberforce, Esq.

The Rev. W. A. Alderson, of Everingham, to the Living of Seaton Ross, in the East Riding of Yorkshire; Patron, M. Constable Maxwell, Esq.

The Rev. John Barber, A.M. of St. John's College, Cambridge, and Curate of the Old Church, Macclesfield, Cheshire, to the Perpetual Curacy of Wilsden, in the parish of Bradford; Patron, the Rev. Henry Heap, Vicar of Bradford.

The Rev. A. Smith to be Curate of Knottingley.

MARRIED.

At Sowerby, near Thirsk, the Rev. Thomas Cautley, to Mary Ann Priscilla, second daughter of the late Rev. Francis Henson, Rector of South Kilvington, Yorkshire.

DECEASED.

The Rev. J. W. Sinclair, Vicar of Hutton Bushel, near Scarborough, and Chaplain to Vicount Downe.

At the Friary, in Newark-upon-Trent, aged 73, the Rev. Wm. Rastall, M.A. Rector of Thorpe, Nottinghamshire.

At Hotham, in his 86th year, the Rev. James Stillingfleet, M.A. Rector of that place.

LONDON.

PREFERRED.

The Rev. George William Curtis, M.A. to the Rectory of Wymington, Essex; Patron, the Lord Bishop.

The Rev. J. E. Tyler, B.D. and Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford, to the Rectory of St. Giles's in the Fields, London; Patron, the Lord Chancellor.

The Rev. Thomas Atwood, M.A. to the Perpetual Curacy of the Hamlet of Hammersmith; Patron, the Lord Bishop.

The Rev. Rich. Wager Allix, B.D. Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, to the Rectory of Great Warley, Essex; Patrons, the Master and Fellows of that Society.

MARRIED.

At Mary-la-Bonne Church, the Rev. Henry Glyn, M.A. Vicar of Henham,

Essex, to Elizabeth, only daughter of the late Joseph Smith, Esq. of Shortgrove, in the same county.

At the Parish Church of St. Mary-labonne, the Rev. Geo. M. Musgrave, M.A. of Brasenose College, Oxford, elder son of Geo. Musgrave, Esq. of Apsley End, Shillington, Bedfordshire, and Borden Hall, Kent, to Charlotte Emily, youngest daughter of Thomas Oakes, Esq. of Upper Seymour-street, Portman-square.

DECEASED.

At Halstead, in Essex, aged 82, the Rev. John Manistre, M. A. Rector of Stower-Provost *cum* Todbere, in the county of Dorset, and formerly Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. B. A. 1769, M. A. 1772. The Rectory is in the patronage of the Provost and Fellows of that society.

The Rev. J. D. Wainwright, of Sturmer Rectory, Essex.

At Hammersmith, aged 67, the Rev. Thomas Stephen Atwood, M.A. of Merton College, Oxford (which Degree he took Dec. 13, 1786), Rector of Buckworth and Morborne, in the county of Huntingdon, and upwards of 38 years Minister of the Hamlet of Hammersmith.

DURHAM.

MARRIED.

At the Collegiate Church, Ripon, the Rev. Charles Bury, B. A. of Redmarshall, in the county of Durham, to Eliza Blacknell, eldest daughter of John Howard, Esq. of Ripon.

DECEASED.

At Stagshaw Close House, Northumberland, aged 87, the Rev. John Thompson, Vicar of Warden.

WINCHESTER.

PREFERRED.

The Rev. R. Rowe to the Vicarage of Misterton, Somersetshire; Patrons, the Dean and Chapter of Winchester.

The Rev. Dr. Cockayne to the Rectory of Dogmersfield, Hants; Patroness, Lady Mildmay.

The Rev. Mr. Riddle to the Living of Easton, near Winchester; Patron, the Lord Bishop.

The Rev. Thomas Westcombe, M. A. Minor Canon of Winchester, to the Vicarage of Preston Candover, Hants; Patrons, the Dean and Chapter of Winchester.

The Rev. Thomas Cooke Kemp, to the Living of East Meon, Hants; Patron, the Lord Bishop.

The Rev. J. Hodges, Vicar of Twyford, to the Rectory of Chilcomb, Hants.

ORDAINED.

By the Lord Bishop, at his Castle at Farnham, on the 24th December.

DEACONS.

Frederick Harry Pare, M. A. Christ Church, Oxford.

Henry Legge, B. A. Christ Church, Oxford.

Wm. Foster, B. A. Trinity College, Cambridge.

Henry Burgess, B. A. Trinity College, Cambridge.

PRIESTS.

William Thomas Blenkinsop, B. A. St. Alban Hall, Oxford.

Proby John Ferrers, B. A. Oriel College, Oxford.

Henry Thompson, M. A. St. John's College, Cambridge.

Charles Lyne, St. John's College, Cambridge.

Samuel Best, B. A. King's College, Cambridge.

MARRIED.

At Richmond, the Hon. and Rev. Baptist Noel, to Miss Baillie, eldest daughter of the late Peter Baillie, Esq. of Dochfour.

At Bungay, the Rev. Gilbert Gilbert, M. A. of Wadham College, Oxford, and of Richmond, Surrey, to Hannah, eldest daughter of Richard Mann, Esq. of Bungay.

DECEASED.

The Rev. Henry Inglis, D. D. Rector of Easton, Hants, and of Hardress *cum* Stelling, Kent, aged 77. Dr. Inglis held successively the Head Mastership of Macclesfield and of Rugby Schools.

At Guildford, aged 64, the Rev. T. Docker, Vicar of Eastmeon, and of Froxfield, Wilts.

Aged 75, the Rev. Wm. Gordon, Rector of Chilcombe, near Winchester.

The Rev. H. H. Champain, late Curate of Winchfield, Hants.

At Southampton, the Rev. J. Burton Phillipson, many years a resident of that city.

The Rev. Richard Bartholomew, Rector of Dunsfold, Surrey.

BATH AND WELLS.**PREFERRED.**

The Rev. Edward Swatman, M. A. to the Vicarage of Dulverton; Patrons, the Dean and Chapter of Wells.

The Rev. William Baker Bere, B. A. of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, to the perpetual and augmented Curacy of Upton, Somerset; Patron, T. Hellings, Esq. Tiverton.

The Rev. E. Wilson, B. A. Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, to the Curacy of St. Michael's, Bath.

The Rev. Wm. Wood, M. A. to the Rectory of Staplegrave; Patron, Vincent Stuckey, Esq.

The Rev. Samuel Blackhall, B. D. Rector of North Cadbury, and late Tutor of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, to a Prebend in Wells Cathedral; Patron, the Lord Bishop.

ORDAINED.

By the Lord Bishop, in Wells Cathedral, on Sunday Nov. 5.

DEACONS.

William Tierney Elton, B. A. Worcester College, Oxford.

Thomas Riddell, B. A. St. Edmund Hall, Oxford.

Francis Charles Alderman, B. A. Exeter College, Oxford.

William Dann Harrison, B. A. Worcester College, Oxford.

Matthew Robert Scott, B. A. Exeter College, Oxford.

Henry Taylor, B. A. Worcester College, Oxford.

Charles Geo. Fred. Vinck, B. A. Magdalen Hall, Oxford.

James Henshaw Gregg, B. A. St. John's College, Cambridge.

William Le' Lievre, B. A. St. John's College, Cambridge.

John Rawes, B. A. Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.

Hugh Speke, B. A. Emmanuel College, Cambridge.

William North, B. A. Clare Hall; Cambridge.

Robert Allwood, B. A. Caius College, Cambridge.

PRIESTS.

James Galloway, M. A. Exeter College, Oxford.

Edward Browne Everard, B. A. Balliol College, Oxford.

William Louth, B. A. Christ Church, Oxford.

Simeon Lloyd Pope, B. A. Trinity College, Oxford.

James Anthony Savage, B. A. Trinity College, Oxford.

William George Sawyer, B. A. Balliol College, Oxford.

Edward Bower, B. A. Jesus College, Cambridge.

John Coombes Collins, B. A. St. John's College, Cambridge.

William Quelkett, B. A. St. John's College, Cambridge.

On Sunday, December 31.

DEACONS.

George Baker, B. A. Wadham College, Oxford.

Edward Nares Henning, B. A. Worcester College, Oxford.

Thomas Hope, B. A. University College, Cambridge.

Caleb Rockett, B. A. St. Peter's College, Cambridge.

Henry Penneck, B. A. St. Peter's College, Cambridge.

PRIESTS.

John Barnaby Lewis, B. A. St. Alban Hall, Oxford.

William Jefferys Allen, B. A. Pembroke College, Cambridge.

G. Warwick Bamfylde Daniell, B. A. Caius College, Cambridge.

Henry Peter Daniell, B. A. Trinity College, Cambridge.

Thomas Earle Pipon, B. A. St. John's College, Cambridge.

William Wickenden, B. A. St. John's College, Cambridge.

Reuben Spry Rendle, B. A. Jesus College, Cambridge.

MARRIED.

At Richmond, Yorkshire, the Rev. D. Tremlett, Rector of Rodney Stoke, near Wells, to Isabella Mary, youngest daughter of the late Thomas Simpson, Esq.

At Kensington Church, by the Rev. Gilbert Alder, B. C. L. the Rev. W. Gunning, L. C. L. Chaplain of Partis College, Bath; to Sarah Anne, eldest daughter of Samuel Hutchins, Esq. of Earl's Court, Kensington.

The Rev. John G. Bowen, of Compton Bishop, to Maria, youngest daughter of the late J. Giles, Esq.

The Rev. Theophilus Biddulph, M. A. Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, to Catherine, eldest daughter of John Lindon, Esq. of Weston Court, Somerset.

DECEASED.

At Newton St. Loe, the Rev. George Hawkins, M. A. Fellow of Corpus Christi College.

At the Vicarage, Wedmore, aged 60, the Rev. J. Richards, M.A. Vicar of Wedmore, Somerset.

BRISTOL.

PREFERRED.

The Rev. Thomas Whitfield, B. D. Fellow of St. John's College, Oxford, to the Living of Winterbourne, Gloucestershire; Patrons, the President and Fellows of St. John's College.

The Rev. William Oldfield Bartlett, M. A. of Merton College, Oxford, to the Vicarage of Canford Magna, with the Chapel of Kingston annexed; Patron, George Tito Brice, Esq.

ORDAINED.

By the Lord Bishop, in the Chapel of Christ College, Cambridge, on Sunday, the 17th December.

DEACONS.

Carr John Glynn, B.A. Christ Church, Oxford.

William Samler Hadley, B.A. Queen's College, Oxford.

Charles Woods, B.A. Pembroke College, Oxford.

Charles Dade, B.A. Caius College, Cambridge.

Henry Arlett, B.A. Pembroke College, Cambridge. *By Let. Dim. from the Bishop of Ely.*

John Day, B.A. Exeter College, Oxford.

Edmund John Senkler, B.A. Caius College, Cambridge. *By Let. Dim. from the Bishop of Norwich.*

Villiers Hen. Plantagenet Somerset, B.A. Christ Church, Oxford. *By Let. Dim. from the Bishop of Llandaff.*

PRIESTS.

George Maxwell, B.A. St. John's College, Cambridge.

Thomas James Dallin, B.A. Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.

Richard Thomas Lancaster, M.A. Exeter College, Oxford. *By Let. Dim. from the Bishop of Rochester.*

Edward Richard Benyon, B.A. St. John's College, Cambridge. *By Let. Dim. from the Bishop of Norwich.*

MARRIED.

At Kington Magna, Dorsetshire, the Rev. Thomas Manners Sutton, Rector of

Great Chert, Kent, and Chaplain to Earl Brownlow, to Lucy Sarah, only child of the Rev. H. S. Mortimer, Rector of Kington Magna.

DECEASED.

At Wimborne Minster, Dorsetshire, aged 82, the Rev. J. Baskett, senior Minister of the Collegiate Church.

CARLISLE.

DECEASED.

At Kirkandrews upon Esk, in his 70th year, after a few days' illness, the Rev. John Nichols.

CHESTER.

PREFERRED.

The Rev. J. Topping, M. A. Curate and Surrogate of Warrington, to the Vicarage of Leigh; Patron, the Right Hon. Lord Lilford.

The Rev. Thomas Lowe, Minister of Becconsal, to be Curate and Surrogate of the Parish Church of Warrington.

The Rev. Richard Jones, to the Perpetual Curacy of Little Leigh, Cheshire; Patron, the Rev. George Henry Webber, Vicar of Great Budworth.

The Rev. G. B. Blomfield, B.A. of Christ College, Cambridge, to the living of Tattenhall, near Chester.

The Rev. J. Streynsham Master, M.A. of Balliol College, Oxford, to the Rectory of Chorley; Patroness, Mrs. Master.

The Rev. T. Burkett, B.A. to the Curacy of the New Church, Chorley.

The Ven. John Headlam, M.A. Rector of Wycliffe, Yorkshire, to the Archdeaconry of Richmond.

DECEASED.

At the Rectory-house, Hallaton, Leicestershire, the Rev. John Wilson, formerly one of the Chaplains of Trinity College, Cambridge, and Head Master of the Grammar School, at Bolton-le-Moor. He proceeded to the Degree of M. A. in 1795.

At Dinglehead, Toxteth Park, near Liverpool, the Rev. John Yates.

CHICHESTER.

PREFERRED.

The Rev. R. Ridsdale, M. A. one of the Senior Fellows of Clarehall, Cambridge, to the Vicarage of Kirdford, near Petworth, Sussex; Patron, the Right Hon. the Earl of Egremont.

ORDAINED.

By the Lord Bishop, in the Cathedral Church, on the 21st December.

DEACONS.

George Wells, B.A. Magdalen College, Oxford.

William Sergison, B.A. Brasenose College, Oxford.

Henry Fearon, B.A. Emmanuel College, Cambridge.

Cecil James Green, B.A. Pembroke College, Cambridge.

John Littler, M.A. St. Peter's College, Cambridge.

Charles Hardy, B.A. Christ's College, Cambridge.

PRIESTS.

David Robinson, M.A. Queen's College, Oxford.

Henry John Ellman, S.C.L. Wadham College, Oxford.

Thomas Hornby, B.A. Christ Church, Oxford.

Nath. Best, B.A. Balliol College, Oxford.

Thomas Moore Foskett, B.A. Exeter College, Oxford.

James P. Rhoades, B.A. Wadham College, Oxford.

Richard Green, B.A. Emmanuel College, Cambridge.

John W. H. Marshall, B.A. St. John's College, Cambridge.

Edward Langdale, B.A. Jesus College, Cambridge.

William Hall, St. Peter's College, Cambridge.

MARRIED.

At Brede, Sussex, the Rev. John Geo. Ash, M.A. of Queen's College, Cambridge, to Caroline Selby, second daughter of the Rev. Robert Hele Selby Hele, Rector of Brede.

At Heathfield, Sussex, the Rev. E. Raynes, of Belmonte, Easttholy, to Mary, only daughter of the late Edward Fuller, Esq. of Heathfield.

ST. DAVID'S.

PREFERRED.

The Rev. W. Morgan, M.A. Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, and Curate of Maidenhead, Berks, to the Vicarage of Llandovery, and to the Rural Deanery of Llangadoch, in the county of Carmarthen; Patron, the Lord Bishop.

The Rev. Daniel Evans, to the Vicarage of Llanofaufawr, with the Three Chapels annexed, Brecon; Patron, the Lord Bishop.

The Rev. Charles Thorp, B.D. of University College, Oxford, and formerly Fellow of that Society, to the Prebend of Llandrindod, in the Collegiate Church of Brecon; Patron, the Lord Bishop.

The Rev. T. Davies, Curate of Ystradgynlais, Breconshire, to the Perpetual Curacy of Coelbron Chapel, in the same county; Patron, the Rev. F. Gough, of Yniscedwyn House.

The Rev. E. Pendrill, Curate of Killabeyll, to the Perpetual Curacy of Llan-guick, Glamorganshire; Patroness, Mrs. Bassett.

The Rev. Francis Baker, to the Rectory of Wyllye; Patron, the Earl of Pembroke.

MARRIED.

The Rev. James Thomas, B.A. of Pembroke College, Oxford, and Head Master of Haverfordwest Grammar School, to Miss Carver, eldest daughter of Daniel Carver, Esq. of Wenallt, Carmarthen-shire.

DECEASED.

The Rev. David Rogers, of Penygraig, near Newcastle Emlyn, Carmarthenshire.

ELY.

PREFERRED.

The Rev. Francis Russell Hall, B.D. Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, to the Rectory of Fulbourn, St. Vigor's, Cambridgeshire; Patrons, the Master and Fellows of that Society.

The Rev. W. Mair, M.A. of Trinity College, Cambridge, to the Vicarage of Fulbourn, All Saints', Cambridgeshire.

The Rev. Geo. Jarvis, to the Vicarage of Tuttington, Norwich; Patron, the Lord Bishop of Ely.

ORDAINED.

Sunday, Nov. 5, by the Lord Bishop of Ely.

DEACONS.

John Birkett, M.A. Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge.

James Bowstead, B.A. Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.

Charles Henry Maturin, M.A. Fellow of King's College, Cambridge.

William Jones, B.A. Emmanuel College, Cambridge.

Frederick Smith, B.A. St. Peter's College, Cambridge.

Fitzgerald Wintour, B.A. Magdalen College, Cambridge.

George H. Eyre, B.A. Pembroke College, Cambridge. *By Let. Dim. from the Archbishop of York.*

Edward Medley, Queen's Coll. Cambridge. *By Let. Dim. from the Bishop of Lincoln.*

George A. Ward, Brasenose College, Oxford. *By Let. Dim. from the Bishop of Rochester.*

PRIESTS.

Robert Cory, M.A. Fellow of Emmanuel College, Cambridge.

J. F. Isaacson, B.A. Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge.

Henry John Rose, M.A. Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge.

Sydney Gedge, B.A. Fellow of Catharine Hall, Cambridge.

William Henry Walker, M.A. Fellow of Queen's College, Cambridge.

William Crawley, B.A. Fellow of Magdalen College, Cambridge.

Stephen Davies, S.C.L. Queen's College, Cambridge.

David Morton, B.A. Trinity College, Cambridge. *By Let. Dim. from the Bishop of London.*

Wm. Brown James, B.A. Jesus College, Cambridge. *By Let. Dim. from the Bishop of Rochester.*

MARRIED.

At Astbury, the Rev. F. R. Hall, Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, and Rector of Fulbourn St. Vigor's, in that county, to Frances, eldest daughter of the late Richard Martin, Alderman, of Congleton, in the county of Chester.

EXETER.

PREFERRED.

The Rev. Reginald Chandos Pole, M.A. of St. Mary Hall, Oxford, and Chaplain to the Countess of St. Germans, to hold the Rectory of Mary Tavy, in the county of Devon, on the presentation of John Buller, Esq. of Morval, in the county of Cornwall, together with the Rectory of Stevrocke, by dispensation.

The Rev. Orlando Hamlyn Williams, B.A. of Balliol College, Oxford, to the Rectory of Clavelleigh, otherwise Clovelly, Devon.

MARRIED.

The Rev. Samuel Henry Duntze, B.A. of Brasenose College, Oxford, eldest son of James Duntze, Esq. of Hensley, near Tiverton, to Frances Palmer, fourth daughter of the Very Rev. the Dean of Cashel.

The Rev. Thomas Tanner, Vicar of Burliscombe, Devon, to Miss Mary Bailly,

of Haywood Cottage, Wellington, Somerset.

DECEASED.

At Leversdon House, Thurlaxton, near Taunton, in the 37th year of his age, the Rev. R. Sayer.

In Queen-square, London, the Rev. Dr. William Forord Michell, Rector of St. Martin's, Looe, Cornwall, and of Oriel College, Oxford; M.A. July 13, 1790; B.D. and D.D. June 28, 1810.

At Exeter, the Rev. Thomas Neucatne, Rector of Wordwell, near Bury, Suffolk; the Living is in the gift of R. Benyon De Beauvoir, Esq.

GLOUCESTER.

PREFERRED.

The Rev. F. Close, to the Perpetual Curacy of Cheltenham, void by the death of the Rev. C. Jervis.

The Rev. John Kempthorne, B.D. to the Rectory of St. Michael, Gloucester; Patron, the Lord Chancellor.

ORDAINED.

On Sunday, December 17, by the Lord Bishop.

DEACONS.

John Marshall Collard, B.A. Exeter College, Oxford.

Watson Buller Pole, B.A. Balliol College, Oxford.

John Missing, B.A. Magdalen Hall, Oxford.

Henry Revell Revell, B.A. Catharine Hall, Cambridge.

PRIESTS.

Thomas Evans, B.A. Oriel College, Oxford.

Henry Pruen, B.A. Oriel College, Oxford.

Edward Palling, B.A. Queen's College, Oxford.

George Thompson, B.A. Queen's College, Oxford.

Arthur Turner, B.A. Exeter College, Oxford.

Orlando Hamlyn Williams, B.A. Balliol College, Oxford.

Samuel Lane, B.A. Exeter College, Oxford.

Richard Shutt, B.A. Emmanuel College, Cambridge.

George Cornwall, Queen's College, Cambridge.

Samuel Rowe, B.A. Jesus College, Cambridge.

DECEASED.

At Stinchcombe, Gloucestershire, in his 82d year, the Rev. Richard Lockety.

The Rev. Charles Jervis, M.A. Chaplain to his Royal Highness the Duke of Cambridge, Rector of Luddenham, Kent, and Perpetual Curate of Cheltenham, aged 44.

HEREFORD.

PREFERRED.

The Rev. W. Bowen, of Kentchurch, to the Perpetual Curacy of Kenderchurch, Herefordshire; Patron, the Earl of Oxford.

LICHFIELD AND COVENTRY.

PREFERRED.

The Rev. William H. C. Lloyd, M.A. and Scholar of Jesus College, Oxford, to the Rectory of Norbury, and likewise to the Vicarage of Ronton, both in the county of Stafford; Patron, Lord Viscount Anson.

The Rev. J. Baylie, to the Chapelry of Bloxwich, Walsall; Patron, (by lapse) the Lord Bishop.

The Rev. W. T. Birds, B.A. to the Rectory of Preston on the Wildmoors, Salop; Patrons, the Trustees of Preston Hospital.

The Rev. W. Davison, M.A. to the Deanery or Peculiar of Hartington; Patrons, the Trustees under the will of the late Sir Hugh Bateman.

The Rev. W. M. Ward, B.A. to the Vicarage of Hartington, Derbyshire; Patron, the Duke of Devonshire.

MARRIED.

The Rev. Charles Thomas Dawes, of Adbaston, Staffordshire, to M. H. Sherwood, eldest daughter of H. Sherwood, Esq. of Wick Episcope.

The Rev. Robert Downs, Vicar of Leamington, Warwickshire, to Philadelphia, youngest daughter of the late J. T. H. Hopper, Esq. of Wilton Castle, Durham.

DECEASED.

At Hodnett Rectory, Salop, the Rev. Geo. Allanson, Prebendary of Ripon, Yorkshire.

At High Offley, Staffordshire, aged 75, the Rev. Thomas Harding, Vicar of Adbaston and Ranton, and 35 years Curate of High Offley.

In his 68th year, the Rev. George Bonney, M.A. Vicar of Sandon, Staffordshire, and formerly Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge.

LINCOLN.

PREFERRED.

The Rev. Henry Atlay, M.A. domestic Chaplain to the Marquess of Exeter, and late Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, to hold the Rectory of Tinwell, in the county of Rutland, by Dispensation, with the Rectory of Great Ponton, in the county of Lincoln; Patron of the latter living, the Rev. Wm. Potchett, M.A. Prebendary of North Grantham.

The Rev. S. Martin, one of the Vicars of Lincoln Cathedral, to the Rectory of St. Mary Magdalen (or Chequer Church), and to the Vicarage of St. Nicolas, both in that city.

The Rev. James Linton, M.A. Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, to the Curacy of Hemingford Grey.

The Rev. C. W. Hughes, B.A. to the Perpetual Curacy of the Chapel of St. John the Evangelist, at Lacey Green, Bucks.

The Rev. G. Woodcock, M.A. of Trinity College, to the Rectory of Caythorpe, Lincolnshire.

The Rev. Mr. Gape, son of the Rev. James Carpenter Gape, of St. Alban's, to the Vicarage of Sibsey, Lincolnshire; Patron, the King.

ORDAINED.

By the Lord Bishop, at Buckden, on Sunday the 24th of September.

DEACONS.

David Fulford Harridge, B.A. Queen's College, Cambridge.

Henry Margetts, M.A. St. John's College, Cambridge.

George Pocock, S.C.L. Trinity Hall, Cambridge.

Woolley Spencer, B.A. Christ College, Cambridge.

Richard Whitelock, B.A. Lincoln College, Oxford.

Henry Reginald Yorke, B.A. St. John's College, Cambridge.

George Harrison, B.A. Lincoln College, Oxford.

William Gray. *Literate.*

Henry John Branson, B.A. Caius College, Cambridge. *By Let. Dim. from the Archbishop of York.*

Edward Cox, B.A. Trinity College, Cambridge. *By Let. Dim. from the Bishop of Exeter.*

PRIESTS.

George Atkinson, B.A. Queen's College, Cambridge.

James Beaven, B.A. St. Edmund Hall, Oxford.

John Peacock Byde, B.A. Pembroke Hall, Cambridge.

Edmund Fisher, M.A. Fellow of St. Peter's College, Cambridge.

John Fry, B.A. Trinity College, Cambridge.

Thomas Harrison, B.A. St. John's College, Cambridge.

Charles William Hughes, B.A. Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.

Augustus Davies Ions, St. John's College, Cambridge.

John Mandell, B.A. Catharine Hall, Cambridge.

George Morley, Catharine Hall, Cambridge.

William Peart, B.A. St. John's College, Cambridge.

Joseph Place, B.A. St. John's College, Cambridge.

Thomas Sanderson, B.A. Magdalen Hall, Oxford.

Thomas Trocke, M.A. Pembroke Hall, Cambridge.

James Taylor Wareing, B.A. Exeter College, Oxford.

Sunday, December 17th.

DEACONS.

Robert B. Buckle, B.A. Fellow of Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge.

William Jennings Hamilton, B.A. Pembroke College, Oxford.

Richard Reade, B.A. Caius College, Cambridge.

Thomas Reamington, B.A. Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.

Henry Davis Ward, B.A. Trinity College, Cambridge.

William Balfour Winniug, M.A. Trinity College, Cambridge.

PRIESTS.

Alexander Joseph Lyon Cavie, B.A. St. John's College, Cambridge.

John Frederic Dawson, S.C.L. Trinity College, Cambridge.

Robert Wade Gery, B.A. Emmanuel College, Cambridge.

Matthew Wilson, B.A. Catharine Hall, Cambridge.

MARRIED.

At St. George's, Hanover-square, the Rev. Sir Francis Whichcote, Bart. of Aswarby, Lincolnshire, to Eliza, only daughter of Robert Bree, M.D. F.R.S. of George Street, Hanover-square.

At Biddenham, Bedfordshire, the Rev. G. H. Bowers, Chaplain to the Gaol,

and Perpetual Curate of Elstow, to Miss Addington, of the former place.

At Boston, the Rev. Joseph Hugill, of Burton Coggles, near Corby, Lincolnshire, to Miss Mary Walker, of Boston, only daughter of the late John Walker, Esq. of Sheffield.

The Rev. John Longhurst, B.A. of Kirkby Mallory, Leicestershire, to Miss Ellis.

At Hughendon, the Rev. Frederick Vincent, M.A. of Brasenose College, to Louisa, second daughter of John Norris, Esq. of Hughendon House, Bucks.

At Fillingham, Lincolnshire, the Rev. C. Roberts, of Coningsby, to Elizabeth, younger daughter of the late Rev. G. Kelly, Prebendary of York.

At All Saints', Hertford, the Rev. R. Ridsdale, M.A. Fellow of Clare Hall, Cambridge, to Audrey Harriet, daughter of the Right Hon. Lord John Townshend.

The Rev. Thomas Morell, Resident and Theological Tutor of Wymondley College, Herts, to Mrs. S. Newton, widow of the late Rev. S. Newton, of Witham.

DECEASED.

At Eton, the Rev. William Cooke, aged 77.

At Ab Kettleby, aged 57, the Rev. James Bingham Copesteaks, Vicar of that place, and of Calverton, near Nottingham.

At Weston Underwood, the Rev. John Buchanan, Perpetual Curate of that place, and Vicar of North Grinstone, Yorkshire.

In Bath, the Rev. Joseph Babington, M.A. and M.D. fourth son of the late Thomas Babington, Esq. of Rothley Temple, Leicestershire.

Aged 32, the Rev. Thomas Margetts, second son of William Margetts, Esq. of Huntingdon.

The Rev. Daniel Stephen Olivier, aged 71, thirty-six years Rector of Clifton, in Bedfordshire.

NORWICH.

PREFERRED.

The Rev. T. Turton, B.D. Fellow of Catharine Hall, Cambridge, to the Rectories of Gimingham and Trunch; Patrons, the Master and Fellows of that Society.

The Rev. Charles Green, B.A. to the Rectory of Buxhall, Suffolk, and also to the Rectory of Harlston, in the same county.

The Hon. and Rev. Hugh Anthony Rous, A.M. to the Vicarage of Reydon, in Suffolk, and also to the Perpetual

Curacy of Southwold, in the said county; Patron of both Preferments, the Right Hon. John Earl of Stradbroke.

The Rev. Henry Alford, M.A. late Fellow of Wadham College, Oxford, to the Rectory of Ampton, Suffolk; Patron, the Right Hon. Lord Calthorpe.

The Rev. Joseph Parson, M.A. to the Consolidated Rectory of Ashwicken and Leziate, Norfolk; Patron, the Rev. Richard Venables, D.D.

The Rev. C. Day, Vicar of Rushmere, Suffolk, to the Perpetual Curacy of Playford, in the same county.

The Rev. William Browne, B.A. Rector of Marlesford, to the Rectory of Little Glemham, with the Perpetual Curacy of Great Glemham annexed, in Suffolk; and

The Rev. L. R. Brown, M.A. to the Rectory of Saxmundham, Suffolk; Patron to both Livings, D. L. North, Esq. of Little Glemham Hall.

ORDAINED.

Sunday, Oct. 15, by the Lord Bishop, in the Cathedral.

DEACONS.

William Brett, B.A. Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.

William Browne, B.A. Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge.

James Carver, B.A. Jesus College, Cambridge.

Henry Clinton, B.A. Fellow of Caius College, Cambridge.

Edward Cole, B.A. St. John's College, Cambridge.

Thomas Currie, B.A. Emmanuel College, Cambridge.

Richard Day, B.A. Caius College, Cambridge.

Charles John Gooch, B.A. Christ Church, Oxford.

William Hall, St. Peter's College, Cambridge.

Thomas Hulton, B.A. Caius College, Cambridge.

Edward Martin, M.A. Trinity College, Dublin.

Edward Millard, B.A. Exeter College, Oxford.

William Stamer, B.A. Trinity College, Dublin.

William Steggall, B.A. Jesus College, Cambridge.

John Hampden Thelwall, M.A. Trinity College, Cambridge.

William Hamilton Turner, B.A. Pembroke Hall, Cambridge.

Nathaniel Wodehouse, B.A. Merton College, Oxford.

PRIESTS.

Robert Jervis Coke Alderson, B.A. Exeter College, Oxford.

William Ayerst, B.A. St. John's College, Cambridge.

John George Carless, B.A. Jesus College, Cambridge.

William Lloyd Gibbon, B.A. St. John's College, Cambridge.

Robert Hawthorn, St. Peter's College, Cambridge.

Charles Holloway, B.A. Queen's College, Cambridge.

Henry Lewin, B.A. Trinity College, Cambridge.

Henry Samuel Livins, M.A. Trinity College, Cambridge.

John May, B.A. Exeter College, Oxford.

Thomas Nunn, B.A. Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge.

William Orger, B.A. St. Edmund Hall, Oxford.

George Ranking, S.C.L. Christ College, Cambridge.

John Francis Treadway, Pembroke Hall, Cambridge.

Charles Walter Winter, B.A. Clare Hall, Cambridge.

MARRIED.

At Troston, Suffolk, the Rev. Walter John Spring Casborne, M.A. of New House, Pakenham, to Anne, daughter of the late Capel Lofft, Esq. of Troston Hall.

The Rev. G. Steward, of Woodbastwick, to Miss C. H. August, daughter of the late Mr. Wm. August, of Great Yarmouth.

The Rev. Thomas Corbould, of Upton, to Hannah, daughter of John Francis, Esq. of Twyford.

DECEASED.

Aged 27, the Rev. Wm. W. Jardine, eldest son of J. K. Jardine, Esq. of Wiscoke, Suffolk.

At Saxmundham, aged 72, the Rev. Wm. Brown, Rector of that parish and Little Glemham, and Perpetual Curate of Great Glemham.

At Sterston, Norfolk, the Rev. Wm. Whitear, M.A. Rector of that parish, and formerly Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge; B.A. 1800; M.A. 1803. The Rectory of Sterston is in the nomination of the Duke of Norfolk, but must be given to a foundation Fellow of St. John's College.

At Runcton, the Rev. W. Drew, Rector of Sandringham and Babingley.

The Rev. William Davy, of Hautbois, Vicar of Tuttington, Norfolk.

At Metton Parsonage, the Rev. Philip Hudson, Rector of Felbrigg and Metton.

Suddenly, while on a visit at Assington Hall, the Rev. John Hallward, Vicar of Assington, Suffolk.

OXFORD.

PREFERRED.

The Rev. A. C. Price, M.A. Fellow of New College, Oxford, to the Vicarage of Chesterton, Oxfordshire; Patrons, the Warden and Fellows of that Society.

The Rev. Rd. Skillicorne Skillicorne, to the Rectory of Salford, on his own petition, as the Patron thereof.

The Rev. H. Davis, M.A. to the Perpetual Curacy of Barfield St. Michael, Oxfordshire; Patron, J. Hall, Esq.

The Rev. Thomas Tunstall Haverfield, B.D. Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, to the Rectory of Godington, in that county; Patrons, the President, Fellows and Scholars of that Society.

The Rev. W. T. Hopkins, M.A. of Pembroke College, Oxford, to the Rectory of Nuffield, Oxfordshire; Patrons, Rev. R. B. Fisher, and Rev. W. T. Hopkins.

The Hon. and Rev. Henry Alfred Napier, M.A. of Christ Church, Oxford, to the Rectory of Swyncombe, in that county; Patron, the King.

ORDAINED.

Sunday, December 21.

In Christ Church Cathedral, by the most Rev. his Grace the Lord Archbishop of Cashel (For the Hon. and Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of this Diocese, in consequence of the severe indisposition of his Lordship).

DEACONS.

Hugh Pollard Willoughby, B.A. Exeter College.

William Hayward Cox, B.A. Pembroke College.

Frederic Francis Edwardes, M.A. Fellow of Corpus Christi College.

Charles Parker Price, B.A. Pembroke College.

Charles Maybery, B.A. Jesus College.

James Matthews, B.A. Wadham College.

Thomas Veré Bayne, M.A. Jesus College.

Henry Brislow Wilson, B.A. Fellow of St. John's College.

Thomas Pitman, B.A. Wadham College.

Edward Kitson, B.A. Fellow of Balliol College.

David Aitchison, M.A. Queen's College.

James Garbett, M.A. Fellow of Brasenose College.

John Cecil Hall, S.C.L. Christ Church.

Henry Legge, S.C.L. Fellow of All Souls' College.

Henry Thorpe, B.A. Fellow of St. John's College.

George Moberley, B.A. Fellow of Balliol College.

Richard Leonard Adams, M.A. Christ Church.

PRIESTS.

Theophilus Biddulph, M.A. Fellow of Corpus Christi College.

Thomas Shaw Hellier, M.A.

Robert Sherson, B.A.

Henry Gregory, B.A.

Robert Alder Thorpe, M.A. Fellow of Corpus Christi College.

Robert Duncombe Warner, M.A.

Thomas Arthur Powys, B.A. Fellow of St. John's College.

Matthew Hughes George Bucle, B.A. Wadham College.

Robert Hussey, B.A. Christ Church.

James Temple Mansel, B.A. Christ Church.

Edward John Wingfield, B.A. Christ Church.

Robert Appleton, B.A. Leafield.

William Francis Harrison, B.A. Magdalen College.

Charles Bathurst, S.C.L. Fellow of All Souls' College.

John William Lockwood, M.A. Christ Church.

James Hughes, B.A. Jesus College.

James Hadley, B.A. Wadham College.

William Watson James Augustus Langford, B.A.

MARRIED.

At St. Aldate's Church, by the Rev. Dr. Shuttleworth, Warden of New College, the Rev. James Lupton, Chaplain of Christ Church and New College, to Miss Anne Dry, second daughter of Mr. Thomas Dry, of the city of Oxford.

At Oddington, the Rev. Geo. Elliott Ranken, B.A. of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, to Harriette Anne, youngest daughter of the late Stephen George Church, Esq. R.N.

DECEASED.

On Monday, Dec. 4. Abram Robertson, D.D. F.R.S. Savilian Professor of Astronomy and Radcliffe Observer, aged 75. Dr. Robertson took his Degree of M.A. in 1782, and B.D. and D.D. in 1807. He succeeded Dr. Smith as Savilian Professor of Geometry in 1797, and was elected Savilian Professor of Astronomy, in the room of Dr. Hornsby, in 1810.

Upon the Professorship in Astronomy becoming vacant, the Vice-Chancellor has to signify the same in writing to the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Lord Chancellor of Great Britain, the Chancellor of the University, the Bishop of London, the principal Secretary of State, the Chief Justices, the Chief Baron of the Exchequer, and the Dean of the Arches, who are the electors and visitors. These illustrious persons are solemnly conjured by the Founder to seek for the ablest Mathematicians in other countries as well as our own; and, without regard to particular Universities or Nations, to elect those whom they shall deem best qualified for the office. On a transmission of their choice, the person so elected is admitted by the University in Convocation.—The Radcliffe Trustees appoint the *Observer*, who nominates his assistant.

The Rev. James Matthews, B.D. Fellow of St. John's College, aged 49.

The Rev. William Burslem, son of the late Rev. William Burslem, Rector of Hanbury, in the county,

Suddenly, in the 63d year of his age, the Rev. Robert Bertie Broughton Robinson, M.A. of Christ Church, Rector of Waterstock, Oxfordshire, and of Emmington, Bucks. He took his Degree of M.A. May 28, 1789.

At Guernsey, the Rev. Peter Maingy, M.A. formerly Scholar of Pembroke College, and late Curate of Bampton, Oxfordshire.

The Rev. Moses Bartholomew, of War-dington, Oxfordshire.

PETERBOROUGH.

ORDAINED.

By the Lord Bishop in the cathedral, on Thursday, December 21st, being St. Thomas's Day.

DEACONS.

Miles Joseph Berkeley, B.A. Christ College, Cambridge.

Brook George Bridges, B.A. Oriel College, Oxford.

Charles William Chalklen, B.A. Trinity College, Cambridge.

John Henry Fludyer, B.A. St. John's College, Cambridge.

PRIESTS.

Jonathan Douphrate, B.A. Magdalene Hall, Oxford.

John Giles Powell, B.A. St. Peter's College, Cambridge.

William Stoddart, M.A. Christ College, Cambridge.

MARRIED.

At South Kirkby, Yorkshire, the Rev. Septimus Hodson, of Sharow House, in the same county, and Rector of Thrapston, Northamptonshire, to Margaret, eldest daughter of the late Allen Halford, Esq. of Davenham, in the county of Chester.

The Rev. William Corbett Wilson, Vicar of Bozeat-cum-Stricton, eldest son of the Rev. William Corbett Wilson, Vicar of Hardwicke Priors-cum-Membris, to Elizabeth, daughter of the late William Whitworth, Esq. of Bedford.

ROCHESTER.

MARRIED.

At St. Mary's, Bryanstone Square, London, the Rev. J. J. Saint, M.A. of Brasenose College, Oxford, and of Speldhurst, Kent, to Sophia Heath, youngest daughter of the late M. W. Wilson, Esq.

At Tunbridge, the Rev. Richard Ramsey Warde, M.A. of Brasenose College, Oxford, to Mary, eldest daughter of the late Aretas Akers, Esq.

SALISBURY.

PREFERRED.

The Rev. John Bright, M.A. to the Prebend of Combe and Harnham, with Ruscombe Northbury annexed, in the Cathedral Church; Patron, the Lord Bishop.

The Rev. James Hitchings, Curate of Sunninghill, Berks, to the Vicarage of Wargrave, in the same county; Patron, Lord Braybrooke.

The Rev. George Stone, M.A. to the Vicarage of Longburton, with the Chapel of Holnest, in the county of Dorset.

The Rev. G. R. Orchard, to the Perpetual Curacy of Christ Church, Road, Somersetshire; Patron, the Venerable the Archdeacon of Sarum.

The Rev. John Ward, B.A. Domestic Chaplain to the Marquis of Aylesbury, to

the Vicarage of Great Bedwin, Wilts; Patron, his Lordship.

The Rev. Charles Grey Cotes, B.A. of Christ Church, Oxford, to the Rectory of Stanton St. Quinten; patron, the Earl of Radnor.

The Rev. R. Downes, M.A. Fellow of New College, Oxford, to the Rectory of Berwick St. John, Wilts; Patrons, the Warden and Fellows of that Society.

ORDAINED.

In the Chapel of the Palace at Sarum, Sunday, September 24, by the Lord Bishop.

DEACONS.

Henry Brown, B.A. Queen's College, Oxford.

Anthony Lewis Lambert, B.A. Trinity College, Oxford.

Thomas George Patrick Attwood, B.A. Pembroke College, Oxford.

Edward Beauchamp St. John, B.A. St. Alban Hall, Oxford.

Daniel James Eyre, B.A. Oriel College, Oxford.

Charles Clifton, B.A. Worcester College, Oxford.

William Barrett, B.A. Magdalen College, Oxford.

William Powley, B.A. Jesus College, Cambridge.

Thomas Husband, B.A. Magdalen College, Cambridge.

Henry Wyatt Cottle, B.A. Sydney Sussex College, Cambridge.

William Start, B.A. Trinity College, Cambridge.

William Sykes, B.A. Sydney Sussex College, Cambridge.

Charles Maitland Long, B.A. Trinity College, Cambridge.

PRIESTS.

George James Huddleston, B.A. Merton College, Cambridge.

John Hartland Worgan, M.A. Pembroke College, Oxford.

James Addir Griffith Colpoys, M.A. Exeter College, Oxford.

William Seaton, Queen's College, Cambridge.

Philip Wentworth Buckham, B.A. St. John's College, Cambridge.

John Ward, B.A. Christ College, Cambridge.

MARRIED.

At St. Giles's in-the-Fields, London, the Rev. W. Start, of Telford, in the county

of Wilts, to Louisa, third daughter of John Gurney, Esq. King's Counsel.

The Rev. William Powley, of Newbury, Berks, to Mary Ann, only daughter of William Vicary, Esq. of Exeter.

At Richmond, the Rev. Sam. Paynter, M.A. of Trinity College, Cambridge, Rector of Hatford, Berks, to Eliza, only daughter of Samuel Paynter, Esq. of Richmond.

DECEASED.

At Hare Hatch, aged 48, the Rev. Philip Trant Nind, Vicar of Wargrave, Berks.

WORCESTER.

PREFERRED.

The Rev. John Lane Freer, A.B. of Trinity College, Cambridge, to the Vicarage of Wasperton, in the county of Warwick; Patron, the Rev. John Lucy, Rector of Hampton Lucy, in the same county.

The Rev. Anthony Berwick Lechmere, M.A. to the Vicarage of Eldersfield, Worcestershire; Patron, Sir Anthony Lechmere, of the Rhydd, Bart.

The Rev. Thomas Wilde, M.A. of Christ Church, Oxford, to the Rectory of St. Andrews, Worcester; Patrons, the Dean and Chapter of Worcester.

The Rev. Robert Farquhar Hook, M.A. Student of Christ Church, Oxford, to the Perpetual Curacy of Moseley, Worcestershire; Patron, the very Rev. the Dean of Worcester, in right of his Vicarage of Bromsgrove.

The Hon. and Rev. T. H. Coventry, M.A. to the Rectory of Hill Croome, Worcestershire; Patron, the King.

The Rev. C. H. Parker, M.A. Fellow of Lincoln College, Oxford, to the Rectory of Great Compton, Worcestershire.

The Rev. William Parker, M.A. Fellow of New College, Oxford, to the Rectory of Little Compton, Worcestershire.

ORDAINED.

By the Lord Bishop, December 1st, in the chapel at Hartlebury Castle.

PRIEST.

John Lane Freer, B.A. Trinity College, Cambridge.

MARRIED.

At Severn Stoke, the Rev. Marmaduke Vavasour, M.A. of Brazenose College, Oxford, to Mary Ann, youngest daughter of the Rev. J. F. S. Fleming St. John, one

of the Prebendaries of Worcester Cathedral.

The Rev. Francis Demainbray, Fellow of Pembroke College, Oxford, to Mary, only daughter of the late Francis Findon, Esq. of Shipston-on-Stour.

SCHOOLS AND HOSPITALS.

The Very Rev. James Hook, D.C.L. of St. Mary Hall, Oxford, and Dean of Worcester, to the Mastership of St. Oswald's Hospital, in the suburbs of that city. Patron, for this turn, the King.

The Rev. H. Alford, to the Mastership of the Free Grammar School at Bideford.

The Rev. Thomas Nalder, to be Minister of Queen Elizabeth's Hospital, Donnington, Berks. Patron, the Rev. Winchcombe Henry Howard Hartley.

The Rev. Charles Taylor, B.A. of Brazenose College, Oxford, to the Head Mastership of the Cathedral School, Hereford.

The Rev. J. R. Major, Thetford, B.A. of Trinity College, Cambridge, to the Head Mastership of the Free Grammar School of Wisbech. Patrons, the Town Bailiff and Capital Burgesses of that town.

The Rev. W. H. Chapman, M.A. to be Second Master of Charterhouse School, Cambridge.

CHAPLAINS AND PREACHERS.

The Rev. James Davis, M.A. Vicar of Chepstow, to be one of the Domestic Chaplains to the Dowager Lady Boston.

The Rev. Courtenay Boyle Bruce, of St. Peter's College, Cambridge, to be Domestic Chaplain to his Royal Highness the Duke of York.

The Rev. C. W. Hughes, Perpetual Curate of Lacey Green Chapel, Bucks, to be Domestic Chaplain to his Grace the Duke of Beaufort.

The Rev. Frederick Leicester, B.A. of Queen's College, Oxford, and Vicar of Candover, Salop, to be Domestic Chaplain to the Right Hon. Lord de Tabley.

The Rev. Wm. Mirehouse, M.A. Rector of Colsterworth, Lincoln, to be Domestic Chaplain to her Royal Highness the Princess Sophia.

The Rev. Thomas Henry White, M.A. of University College, Oxford, and Priest

Vicar of Litchfield Cathedral, to be one of the Domestic Chaplains to the Marquis of Downshire.

The Rev. John Horsford, B.A. of Queen's College, Oxford, and Curate of Weymouth and Wyke, to be one of the Domestic Chaplains to the Right Hon. the Earl of Aberdeen.

The Rev. Thomas Henderson, M.A. Student of Christ Church, Oxford, to be Domestic Chaplain to the Right Hon. the Earl of Verulam.

The Rev. John Worgan Dew, Curate of Whitkirk and Roundhay, to be one of the Domestic Chaplains to Lord Viscount Strathallan.

The Rev. William Fowler Holt, M.A. late Fellow of King's College, Cambridge, to be Minister of Laura Chapel, Bath.

PREFERRED.

Church of Ireland.

His Majesty's Letters Patent have passed the Great Seal of Ireland, for promoting the Rev. JOHN BRINKLEY, D.D. to the Bishopric of Cloyne, vacant by the death of Dr. CHARLES M. WARBURTON.

Church of Scotland.

The Rev. R. Buchanan, to the Church and Parish of Gargunnoch.

The Rev. Tho. Cannan, to the Church and Parish of Carsephain.

The Rev. James Maitland, to the Church and Parish of Kells.

The Rev. Wm. Dow, to the Church and Parish of Tonglant.

The Rev. John Lamb, to the Church and Parish of Kirkmaiden.

The Rev. Jacob Richardson, to the Church and Parish of Largs.

The Rev. James Walker, to the Church and Parish of Muthil.

The Rev. Wm. Menzies, to the Church and Parish of Keir.

The Rev. Mr. Dunn, to the Church and Parish of Slaines.

The Rev. Duncan Macfarlane, to the Parochial Chapel of Anderton, in the Barony Parish of Glasgow.

The Rev. J. J. Macfarlane, to the Chapel of Arbroath.

New South Wales.

The Rev. C. P. N. Wilton, M.A. Fellow of the Cambridge Philosophical Society, late Scholar of St. John's College, Cambridge, has been appointed Superintendent of the Female Orphan School at Paramatta, and Chaplain to the Colony in New South Wales. Patron, Earl Bathurst.

MARRIED.

The Rev. John Maynard, M.A. of Exeter College, Oxford, eldest son of Walter Maynard, Esq. of the Island of Nevis, to Elizabeth, second daughter of the late Robert Claxton, Esq. of Bristol.

The Rev. William Stamer, of Ingolds-thorp, Norfolk, second son of Sir William Stamer, Bart. of Dublin, to Ann Margaret, second daughter of the late Colonel Lock, of the East India Company's service.

The Rev. John Rowley, Prebendary of St. Michael's Dublin, and Rector of Lurgan, to Catherine, second daughter of Joseph Clarke, Esq. of Goswell-street, London.

At Edinburgh, the Rev. James Gregory, Precentor of Kildare, and Rector of Harristown, to Jane, eldest daughter of the late Alexander Begbie, Esq. of London.

The Rev. Travers Jones, of Athlone, to Frances Sarah, eldest daughter of the late J. A. Newton, Esq. of Cheadle Heath, Cheshire.

At the British Ambassador's Chapel, at Paris, the Rev. Mr. Hill, to Maria, eldest daughter of the late Wakeman Long, Esq. of Upton-upon-Severn.

DECEASED.

Scotland.

In the Manse of Nigg, at the advanced age of 89, the Rev. D. Cruden, D.D. fifty-seven years Minister of that parish.

The Rev. George Wright, D.D. one of the Ministers of Stirling.

The Rev. W. Peebles, D.D. aged 75, Minister of Newton, Ayr.

Geneva.

At Geneva, the Hon. and Rev. R. S. L. Melville, M.A. of Trinity College, Cambridge.

East Indies.

At Bhoog, on the 8th of March, aged 27, the Rev. Thomas Lavie, Chaplain to the Troops in Cutch, and eldest son of the late Sir Thomas Lavie, K.C.B.

PROCEEDINGS
OF
THE UNIVERSITIES.

OXFORD.

DEGREES CONFERRED.—FROM OCTOBER TO DECEMBER, INCLUSIVE.

BACHELOR AND DOCTOR IN DIVINITY—
(*by accumulation.*)

December 1.

The Rev. William Vansittart, Christ Church, Grand Compounder.

DOCTORS IN CIVIL LAW.

October 19.

Charles Bellamy, Fellow of St. John's College, and one of the Fellows on the Vinerian Foundation.

October 26.

Robert Marsham, Esq. Warden of Merton College.

DOCTORS IN MEDICINE.

October 19.

Charles Joseph Bishop, St. Mary Hall.

MASTERS OF ARTS.

October 10.

Richard Leonard Adams, Christ Church, Grand Compounder.

The Rev. Thomas Shaw Hellier, Lord Crewe's Exhibitioner, of Lincoln College.

The Rev. John Welsh, Queen's College.

The Rev. George Henry Webber, Christ Church.

The Rev. Honoratus Leigh Thomas, Christ Church.

The Rev. Thomas Henderson, Christ Church.

The Rev. Augustus Short, Christ Church.

October 19.

John Bramston, Exeter College.

October 26.

The Rev. John Phillips Roberts, New College.

The Rev. Charles Joseph Pring, New College.

James Harwood Harrison, Merton College.

November 16.

Edward Denison, Fellow of Merton College, Grand Compounder.

John Hopkins, St. John's College, Grand Compounder.

Edward Hinchliffe, Worcester College.

The Rev. John Jones, St. Alban Hall.

The Rev. Charles Harbin, Fellow of Wadham College.

November 23.

The Rev. Henry Haddon Green, Worcester College.

The Rev. Anthony Berwick Lechmere, Christ Church.

December 1.

David Aitcheson, Queen's College,

The Rev. William Penfold, Lincoln College.

The Rev. William Busfield, Scholar of University College.

The Rev. James John Goodall, Pembroke College.

December 7.

The Rev. Charles Walcot, Trinity College, Grand Compounder.

The Rev. Robert Sanders, Magdalen Hall.

Edward Trafford Leigh, Brasenose College.

William Barrett, Magdalen College.

The Rev. David Jones, Jesus College.

The Rev. George St. John, Wadham College.

December 18.

The Rev. Christopher Rawlins, Merton College, Grand Compounder.

The Rev. John Gladstone, Brasenose College.

The Rev. Frederick Urquhart, Brasenose College.

The Rev. John Langley, Magdalen Hall.

BACHELORS IN DIVINITY.

November 16.

George Hornby, Fellow of Brasenose College.

December 18.

The Rev. John Thomas Lys, Fellow of Exeter College.

BACHELORS OF ARTS.

October 10.

William Henry Parson, Magdalen Hall.

October 19.

George Heron, Brasenose College.

Samuel John Ingram Lockhart, Lincoln College.

Wilson Hetherington, Trinity College.

George Henry Bosanquet, Trinity College.

Jacob Joseph Marsham, Christ Church.

John Perry, Scholar of Balliol College.

John West, Worcester College.

Thomas Harding, Worcester College.

William Scott Robinson, Exeter College.

Philip Lovell Phillips, Exeter College.

November 16.

Samuel Vere Dashwood, Brasenose College, Grand Compounder.

Thomas Fielder Woodham, Worcester College.

Henry Chaytor, St. Mary Hall.

Richard John Beadon, Queen's College.

Charles Henry John Anderson, Oriel College.

Samuel Wilberforce, Oriel College.

Rowland Webster, Lord Crewe's Exhibitioner, Lincoln College.

William Yarnton Mills, Trinity College.

George Dawson, Trinity College.

George Gregory Gardiner, Exeter College.

November 23.

Henry Denny, Worcester College.

Edward Powlett Blunt, Corpus Christi College.

Edmund Barker Ray, Brasenose College.

William Blundell, Brasenose College.

Robert Marriott Caldecott, Brasenose College.

John Day, Exeter College.

John Byron, Exeter College.

Thomas Collett, Trinity College.

Henry Hodgkinson Robart, Christ Church.

Thomas Griffith, Jesus College.

William Capel, Merton College.

William Curling, Wadham College.

Morgan Davies, Wadham College.

John Goulter Dowling, Wadham College.

William Thomas Clarke, Queen's College.

Christopher Francis Godmond, Queen's College.

Thomas Clarke, Pembroke College.

December 1.

Thomas Harding, Worcester College.

William Hodgson, Queen's College.

Samuel Hingston, Lincoln College.

Edward John Ward, Trinity College.

John Thomas Hope, Christ Church.

Peter Maurice, Jesus College.

George Lea, Wadham College.

George Robert Kensit, Wadham College.

Thomas Penruddocke, Wadham College.

George Henry Montagu, Balliol College.

John Ley, Exeter College.

Henry Moresby, Exeter College.

December 7.

Thomas Sheppard Smith, Worcester College.

John Thomas Trevelyan, St. Mary Hall.

George Ferris Whidborne Mortimer,

Michel Fellow of Queen's College.

Richard Postlethwaite, Edmund Hall.
 Sommerton Tudor, Edmund Hall.
 Robert Henry King, Magdalen Hall.
 Edmund Pepys, Oriel College.
 William Surman, Trinity College.
 The Lord Viscount Newark, Christ Church.
 William Dowdeswell, Christ Church.
 Charles Pocock, Christ Church.
 Arthur Johnson, Christ Church.
 Alfred Browne, Christ Church.
 Charles Stone, University College.
 William Faber, University College.
 John Forster Alleyne, Balliol College.
 Henry Thorpe, Fellow of St. John's College.
 Joseph Berry King, Exeter College.

December 18.

Frederick Henry Tompson, Queen's College.
 Henry James Buckoll, Michel Scholar of Queen's College.
 William Robert Bigg, Queen's College.
 Henry Wrightson, Queen's College.
 George Wood, Lord Crewe's Exhibitioner of Lincoln College.
 Lovelace Bigg Wither, Oriel College.
 John Wordsworth, New College.
 Edward Simms, Wadham College.
 David Scott Meikleham, Balliol College.
 Francis Blake Woodward, Balliol College.
 Frederick Eyre, St. John's College.
 Frederick Pym, Worcester College.
 John Crosse, Exeter College.

BACHELOR IN CIVIL LAW.

October 27.

Robert Marsham, Esq. M.A. and Warden of Merton College.

BACHELOR OF MUSIC.

December 7.

Mr. W. Marshall, Organist of Christ Church, and of St. John's.

MISCELLANEOUS INTELLIGENCE.

September 28.

The Rev. G. B. Boraston was elected Fellow of Queen's College, on Mr. Michel's Foundation.

October 9.

In full Convocation, the Rev. RICHARD JENKINS, D.D. Master of Balliol College, was nominated and admitted Vice-Chan-

cellor of the University; and, at the same time, Mr. Vice-Chancellor nominated the Rev. George William Hall, D.D. Master of Pembroke College, the Rev. John Collier Jones, D.D. Rector of Exeter College, the Rev. George Rowley, D.D. Master of University College, and the Rev. Ashurst Turner Gilbert, D.D. Principal of Brasenose College, to be his Pro-Vice-Chancellors for the ensuing year.

October 17,

Mr. Henry Edward Knatchbull was admitted a Founder's Kin Scholar of Wadham College.

October 18.

The Rev. C. K. Williams, M.A. Scholar of Pembroke College, was admitted a Fellow of that society.

The Rev. John Whittington Ready Landor, M.A. of Worcester College, was admitted Probationary Fellow of Exeter College, on the nomination of the Dean and Chapter of Exeter.

October 20.

Mr. Edward Cockey, of the Diocese of Bath and Wells, was admitted Scholar of Wadham College.

October 27.

Francis Rawlinson Robinson, M.A. Scholar of Corpus Christi College, of the county of Oxford, was admitted a Probationer Fellow of that Society.

November 7.

The nomination of the Rev. James Thos. Round, M.A. and Fellow of Balliol College, as one of the Public Examiners in *Literis Humanioribus*, was approved in Convocation.

The Rev. Charles Atmore Ogilvie, M.A. and Fellow of Balliol College, has been nominated and approved in Convocation as a Delegate of Accounts, in the room of the Very Rev. the Dean of Chester, resigned.

November 10.

Charles John Boyle, Esq. was admitted Founder's Kin Fellow of All Souls' College.

November 28.

Edward Kitson, B.A. and Scholar, George Moberly, B.A. both of Balliol College, and Francis William Newman, B.A. of Worcester College, were elected Fellows of the former Society.

November 29.

Mr. Henry Weir White, B.A. Scholar of Jesus College, was elected a Fellow of that Society.

December 1.

Mr. Whitfield was elected Scholar of Corpus Christi College on the Oxfordshire Foundation.

December 5.

The nomination of the following Gentlemen to be Select Preachers for 1827 was unanimously approved of in Convocation :—

The Rev. Charles M. Mount, M.A. late Fellow of Corpus Christi College.

The Rev. John A. Cramer, M.A. late Student of Christ Church.

The Rev. Frederick C. Blackstone, B.C.L. late Fellow of New College.

The Rev. Charles Carr Clerke, M.A. Student of Christ Church.

The Rev. Charles Girdlestone, M.A. late Fellow of Balliol College.

On the same day, the Rev. Henry Hart Milman, M.A. late Fellow of Brasenose College, was unanimously re-elected Professor of Poetry.

December 18.

The nomination of John Williams, M.A. Student of Christ Church, to be one of the Masters of the Schools, was approved of in Convocation.

The Rev. George Taylor, M.A. of Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, and Master of Dedham School, was incorporated as a member of St. John's College.

December 22.

The Rev. Theophilus Biddulph, M.A. was admitted a Probationary Fellow of Corpus Christi College.

December 24.

Messrs. Robert William Goodenough, Wm. Emmanuel Page, Frederick Biscoe, John Robert Hall, and Henry Partington, were admitted actual Students of Christ Church, having been elected from Westminster in May last.

The following Noblemen have been admitted Members of Christ Church, in the last Term :—Lord Marsham, son of the Earl of Romney; the Earl of Rawdon, son of the Marquis of Hastings; Lord Villiers, son of the Earl of Jersey; and

the Earl of Ossory, son of the Marquis Ormonde.

Congregations will be holden for the purpose of granting Graces, and conferring Degrees, on the following days in the ensuing Term, viz.

| | |
|------------------|--------------------|
| Jan. Monday, 15 | Mar. Thursday, 8 |
| Feb. Thursday, 1 | — Thursday, 15 |
| — Thursday, 8 | — Thursday, 22 |
| — Thursday, 15 | — Thursday, 29 |
| — Thursday, 22 | April, Saturday, 7 |
| — Tuesday, 27 | |

No person will, on any account, be admitted as a candidate for the Degree of B.A. or M.A. or for that of B.C.L. without proceeding through Arts, whose name is not entered in the book, kept for that purpose at the Vice-Chancellor's house, on or before the day preceding the day of congregation.

EXAMINATIONS.

The names of those candidates, who at the close of the Public Examinations in Michaelmas Term, were admitted by the Public Examiners into the three Classes of *Literæ Humaniores* and *Discipline Mathematicæ et Physicæ* respectively, according to the alphabetical arrangement of each class prescribed by the statute, stand as follow :—

1st Class.—In *Literæ Humaniores*.

Denison, Geo. Anthony, Christ Church.
Hope, John Thomas, Christ Church.
Mortimer, George Ferres Whidborne, Queen's College.

Newark, Right Hon. Viscount, Christ Church.

2nd Class.

Bentinck, Lord Henry Cavendish, Christ Church.
Blunt, Edward Powlett, Corpus Christi College.

Gower, John Alexander, Magdalen College.

Lea, George, Wadham College.
Simms, Edward, Wadham College.
Trower, Walter John, Christ Church.
Wilberforce, Samuel, Oriel College.
Wither, Lovelace Bigg, Oriel College.

3rd Class.

Bevan, Charles D. Balliol College.
Buckoll, Henry James, Queen's College.

Chambers, John David, Oriel College.
 Clay, James, Balliol College.
 Collett, Thomas, Trinity College.
 Crosse, John Dudley, Exeter College.
 Davies, Morgan, Wadham College.
 Dawson, George, Exeter College.
 Eden, Robert, Christ Church.
 Harding, John, Worcester College.
 Heming, Thomas John, Christ Church.
 Lawrence, Charles Washington, Brasenose College.
 Smythe, Patrick Murray, Christ Church.

JOHN WILSON,
 EDWARD BURTON,
 PHILIP WYNTER,
 JOSEPH DORNFORD,
 ROBT. BATEMAN PAUL,
 JAMES THOMAS ROUND, } Examiners.

1st Class.—*In Discip. Mathemat. et Phys.*

Dawson, George, Exeter College.
 Maude, Joseph, Queen's College.
 Maurice, Robert, Christ Church.
 Trower, Walter John, Christ Church.
 Webster, Rowland, Lincoln College.
 Wilberforce, Samuel, Oriel College.

WILLIAM KAY,
 RICHARD GRESWELL, } Examiners.
 ROBERT WALKER,

The number of candidates who form the Fourth Class, but whose names are not published, amounts to 101.

PRIZES.

CHANCELLOR'S PRIZES.

[Three Prizes of £20 each are annually given for the best compositions in Latin Verse, Latin Prose, and English Prose.]

Subjects for 1827.

Latin Verse—"Mexicum."

English Essay—"The influence of the Crusades upon the arts and literature of Europe."

Latin Essay—"Lex apud Romanos agraria."

SIR ROGER NEWDIGATE'S PRIZE.

Subject for 1827.

English Verse—"Pompeii."

REV. DR. ELLERTON'S THEOLOGICAL PRIZE.

[Of £21 annually, for the best English Essay on some doctrine or duty of the

Christian Religion, or on some of the points on which we differ from the Romish Church, or on any other subject of Theology which shall be deemed meet and useful.]

Subject for 1827.

"What was the object of the Reformers in maintaining the following proposition, and by what arguments did they establish it? 'Holy Scripture is the only sure foundation of any article of faith.'"

SUMMARY OF THE MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY THIS YEAR.

| | Members of Con- vocation. | Members on the Books. |
|--------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1 University . . . | 105 . . | 205 |
| 2 Balliol . . . | 83 . . | 220 |
| 3 Merton . . . | 68 . . | 119 |
| 4 Exeter . . . | 81 . . | 249 |
| 5 Oriel . . . | 144 . . | 275 |
| 6 Queen's . . . | 135 . . | 314 |
| 7 New . . . | 62 . . | 143 |
| 8 Lincoln . . . | 54 . . | 127 |
| 9 All Souls . . . | 68 . . | 94 |
| 10 Magdalen . . . | 114 . . | 163 |
| 11 Brasenose . . . | 228 . . | 425 |
| 12 Corpus . . . | 67 . . | 114 |
| 13 Christ Church . . . | 404 . . | 800 |
| 14 Trinity . . . | 87 . . | 222 |
| 15 St. John's . . . | 127 . . | 217 |
| 16 Jesus . . . | 56 . . | 173 |
| 17 Wadham . . . | 65 . . | 185 |
| 18 Pembroke . . . | 66 . . | 170 |
| 19 Worcester . . . | 86 . . | 204 |
| 20 St. Mary Hall . . . | 29 . . | 76 |
| 21 Magdalen Hall . . . | 38 . . | 150 |
| 22 New Inn Hall . . . | 1 . . | 1 |
| 23 St. Alban Hall . . . | 11 . . | 45 |
| 24 St. Edmund Hall . . . | 41 . . | 103 |
| | 2220 | 4794 |

Determining Bachelors in Lent . . 281

Matriculations . 401 | Regents . . 194

TERMS for 1827.

Lent Term begins Jan. 15, ends Apr 7
 Easter Term . Apr. 25, . . June 2
 Trinity Term . June 6, . . July 7
 Michaelmas Term, Oct. 10, . . Dec. 17

The Act will be July 3.

CAMBRIDGE.

DEGREES CONFERRED FROM OCTOBER TO DECEMBER, INCLUSIVE.

DOCTOR IN DIVINITY.

December 15.

Rev. Joseph Lawson Sisson, Clare Hall.

December 7.

C. Giles Bridle Daubeny, Doctor of Medicine, Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, and Aldrichian Professor of Chemistry, was admitted *ad eundem*.

HONORARY MASTERS OF ARTS.

December 4.

Hon. Francis George Molyneux, Trinity College.

Hon. Frederick Dudley Ryder, Trinity College.

MASTERS OF ARTS.

October 10.

Rev. John Richardson Major, Trinity College.

Richard Andrew, Trinity College.

Rev. James Hargreaves, St. John's College.

Rev. Thomas Ward Franklyn, St. John's College.

Rev. Charles Pleydell Neale Wilton, St. John's College.

Rev. Thomas Taylor, Catharine Hall.

October 13.

Thomas Sewell, Sidney College.

October 23.

William Balfour Winning, Trinity College.

Rev. Henry Jeffreys, St. John's College.

William Newland Welsby, St. John's College.

Rev. Thomas Scott Scratton, Christ's College.

November 13.

Rev. Charles Whately, Trinity College.

Rev. David Morton, Trinity College.

Frederick North, St. John's College.

Compounder.
John Longe, Jesus College.

Rev. T. B. Whitehurst, St. Peter's College, Compounder.

Rev. R. Montgomery, St. Peter's College, Compounder.

December 4.

Joshua S. Crompton, Jesus College.

December 15.

Rev. Frederick Fitzwilliam Trench, St. Peter's College.

Rev. Edward Martin, St. Peter's College, *ad eundem*, incorporated from Dublin.

Rev. Thomas Hutton Crofts, Pembroke Hall.

LICENTIATES IN PHYSIC.

December 4.

Thomas Waterfield, M.B. Christ College, Compounder.

December 15.

Benjamin Babington, M. B. Pembroke Hall.

BACHELORS IN DIVINITY.

November 13.

Rev. William Hewson, St. John's College, Compounder.

December 15.

Rev. Carew Thomas Elers, Queen's College.

Rev. Daniel Croathwaite, Queen's College.

BACHELORS OF ARTS.

October 9.

Richard Fienes Wykcham Martin, Trinity College.

Edward King Tenison, Trinity College, Compounder.

Joshua Frederick Denham, St. John's College.

Alexander Power, Catharine Hall, Compounder.

Tyson Milnes, Catharine Hall.
Francis Law, Queen's College.
Joseph Gattey, Sidney College.

October 13.

John Chapman, Fellow of King's College.

George Hamilton, Fellow of King's College.

E. J. Owen, Downing College, Compounder.

October 21.

Mr. Henry Penneck, St. Peter's College.

December 15.

Oswald Marriott, St. John's College.

BACHELORS IN CIVIL LAW.

November 13.

Rev. Charles Williams, Trinity Hall.

Rev. William Webster, Jesus College.

Rev. John Badcock, St. Peter's College.

December 4.

Rev. William Mitchell, Trinity Hall.

Charles Barrett Lennard, Trinity Hall.

Rev. Henry De Brett, Downing College.

December 15.

Robert Bowcher Clarke, Trinity College.

BACHELOR IN PHYSIC.

December 15.

William Crosbie Mair, Jesus College.

MISCELLANEOUS INTELLIGENCE.

October 2.

Messrs. Thomas Remington, B.A. James Amiraux Jeremie, B.A. and James Challis, B.A. Scholars of Trinity College, were elected Fellows of that Society.

October 10, (first day of Term).

The following gentlemen were elected University Officers for the year ensuing :

PROCTORS.

The Rev. John Tomkyns, M.A. King's College.

The Rev. Stephen Pope, M.A. Emanuel College.

TAXORS.

The Rev. John Hind, M.A. Sidney College.

The Rev. Henry Venn, M.A. Queen's College.

MODERATORS.

The Rev. Joshua King, M.A. Queen's College.

The Rev. Henry Coddington, M.A. Trinity College.

SCRUTATORS.

The Rev. Thomas Dickes, M.A. Jesus College.

The Rev. Henry Tasker, M.A. Pembroke Hall.

October 12.

The following gentlemen were appointed the Caput for the year ensuing :—

The Vice-Chancellor.

Rev. Martin Davy, D.D. Master of Caius College, *Divinity*.

Rev. J. W. Geldart, D.C.L. Trinity Hall, *Law*.

John Haviland, M.D. St. John's College, *Physic*.

Rev. George Elwes Corrie, Catharine Hall, *Senior Non-Regent*.

Rev. Alfred Ollivant, M.A. Trinity College, *Senior-Regent*.

October 21.

The Rev. Thomas S. Hughes, B.D. of Emmanuel College, and the Rev. Richard Twopeny, M.A. of St. John's College, were appointed Pro-Proctors for the year ensuing.

A letter has been addressed to the Vice-Chancellor by the Right Hon. Charles Williams Wynn, President of the India Board, of which the following is an extract :—

"Enclosed I have the honour to transmit to you a copy of the Regulations for the examination of candidates for Writerships in the service of the East India Company, which have been prepared by the Court of Directors, with the approbation of the Board of Commissioners for the affairs of India. You will find that it is proposed that two Examiners should be appointed from the University of Cambridge by the Vice-Chancellor and Regius Professors, with an annual stipend of £80, one of them to be annually replaced."

" Plan for the examination of candidates for admission to the Civil Service, who have not resided at the College of Haileybury.

" The candidates will be examined in the Greek Testament, and in some of the works of the following Greek Authors, viz. Homer, Herodotus, Demosthenes, or in the Greek plays; also in some of the works of the following Latin Authors, viz. Livy, Cicero, Tacitus, and Juvenal, which part of the Examination will include collateral reading in Ancient History, Geography, and Philosophy.

" They will also be examined in Mathematics, including the four first and sixth Books of Euclid, Algebra, Logarithms, Plane Trigonometry, and Mechanics.

" In Modern History, principally taken from 'Russell's Modern Europe,' and in 'Paley's Evidences of Christianity.' "

October 30.

The Rev. Temple Chevallier, M.A. late Fellow and Tutor of Catharine Hall, Hulsean Lecturer, and the Rev. Alfred Ollivant, M.A. Fellow of Trinity College, were on Monday last elected Examiners of the Candidates for Writerships in the service of the East India Company, who have not resided at the College of Haileybury.

November 4.

The Rev. Christopher Wordsworth, D.D. Master of Trinity College, was elected Vice-Chancellor of the University for the year ensuing.

November 15.

In congregation the Rev. Watkin Maddy, M.A. Fellow of St. John's College, was appointed Moderator, in the room of J. King, Esq. Fellow of Queen's College, resigned.

At the same congregation a grace passed the Senate to give £50 from the university chest to the subscription for rebuilding the English church at Amsterdam.

December 6.

In congregation graces to the following effect passed the Senate :—

To appoint Mr. Byam, of King's, Mr. Weller, of Emmanuel, Mr. Graham, of Christ's College, and Mr. T. P. Platt, of Trinity, Examiners, at the classical examination after admission ad respondendum quæstioni.

To appoint Mr. Rennell, of King's, Mr. Waterfield, of Emmanuel, Mr. Adams, of Sidney, and Mr. Fennell, of Queen's, Examiners at the previous examination in Lent Term, 1827.

To appoint Mr. Maddy Deputy Proctor in the absence of Mr. Pope.

To present a copy of each of the books printed at the expense of the University to the library of St. David's College, Lampeter.

December 7.

George Biddell Airy, Esq. M.A. Fellow of Trinity College, was elected Lucasian Professor of Mathematics, on the resignation of the Rev. Thomas Turton, B.D. Mr. Airy took his first degree in 1823, being thus early the Senior Wrangler of his year; and has, at successive meetings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society, communicated the results of various scientific investigations.

James Parke, Esq. M.A. Barrister at Law, is elected Auditor of Trinity College, in the room of Sir Nicholas Conyngham Tindal, his Majesty's Solicitor General.

Lord Gardner is admitted of Trinity College.

Two Craven scholarships are now vacant. The examination of candidates will commence on the 29th of January next.

December 15.

In a congregation this day, graces to the following effect passed the Senate :—

To confer the degree of D.D. by Royal Mandate, on Mr. Mill, Principal of Bishop's College, Calcutta.

To appoint Mr. Hind, of Sidney, and Mr. Cantis, of Christ's College, Examiners, with the Proctors and Moderators, of the first six classes of Questionists, in January, 1827.

To appoint Mr. Chevallier, Mr. Warren, Mr. Kirby, and Mr. Foley, Examiners of the seventh and eighth classes of Questionists, in January, 1827.

To appoint Mr. Rennell and Mr. Waterfield additional Examiners, of the seventh and eighth classes of Questionists, in January, 1827.

December 16.

The Right Hon. Sir John Copley, Master of the Rolls, was unanimously re-elected Representative in Parliament for this University.

There will be congregations on the following days of the Lent term :—

Saturday . . . Jan. 20, (Bachelor's Com.) at ten.
 Wednesday . . Feb. 7, at eleven.
 Wednesday . . March 7, at eleven.
 Friday 30, (M.A. Inceptors) at ten.
 Friday April 6, (end of term) at ten.

SUMMARY OF THE MEMBERS OF THE
 UNIVERSITY THIS YEAR.

| | Members of the Senate. | Members on the Boards. |
|--------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Trinity College . . . | 597 . . . | 1375 |
| St. John's College . . | 444 . . . | 1082 |
| Queen's College . . . | 61 . . . | 290 |
| Emmanuel College . . | 99 . . . | 215 |
| Christ's College . . . | 59 . . . | 224 |
| Jesus College . . . | 74 . . . | 191 |
| Caius College . . . | 78 . . . | 228 |
| St. Peter's College . . | 59 . . . | 192 |
| Clare Hall . . . | 62 . . . | 156 |
| Corpus Christi College . | 37 . . . | 153 |
| Trinity Hall . . . | 27 . . . | 138 |
| Catharine Hall . . . | 30 . . . | 133 |
| Pembroke Hall . . . | 43 . . . | 111 |
| King's College . . . | 85 . . . | 109 |
| Sidney College . . . | 36 . . . | 94 |
| Magdalen College . . . | 37 . . . | 98 |
| Downing College . . . | 14 . . . | 65 |
| Commorantes in Villa . | 12 . . . | 12 |
| | 1854 | 4866 |

Comparative View of Members on the
 Boards.

| | |
|------------|------|
| 1748 . . . | 1500 |
| 1813 . . . | 2805 |
| 1824 . . . | 4489 |
| 1826 . . . | 4866 |

This University has a majority of seventy-four members over that of Oxford this year.

PRIZES.

HULSEAN PRIZE.

[A prize of £40 to any Member of the University under the degree or standing of M.A. who composes the best Dissertation, in the English language, on the Evidences in general, or on the Prophecies or Miracles in particular,

or on any other particular argument, whether the same be direct or collateral proof of the Christian Religion, in order to evince its truth and excellence.]

Subject for the past year :—

A critical examination of our Saviour's Discourses, with regard to the evidence which they afford of his Divine Nature.

Adjudged to—

William Michael Mayers, Catharine Hall.

Subject for the present year :—

The Contention between Paul and Barnabas.

CHANCELLOR'S GOLD MEDAL.

[For the best English Poem by a Resident Undergraduate.]

Subject for the present year :—

The Druids.

N.B.—These exercises are to be sent in to the Vice-Chancellor on or before March 31, 1827; and are not to exceed 200 lines in length.

MEMBERS' PRIZES.

[1. Two prizes of fifteen guineas each, for the encouragement of Latin Prose composition, to be open to all Bachelors of Arts, without distinction of years, who are not of sufficient standing to take the degree of Master of Arts: and 2. Two other prizes of fifteen guineas each, to be open to all Undergraduates, who shall have resided not less than seven terms, at the time when the exercises are to be sent in.]

The subjects for the present year are :—

1. For the Bachelors.

Homerus.

2. For the Undergraduates.

Græcia capta ferum victorem cepit, et artes Intulit agresti Latio.

N.B.—These exercises are to be sent in on or before April 30, 1827.

SIR WILLIAM BROWNE'S MEDALLISTS.

[Three Gold Medals, of five guineas each, to three Undergraduates :—1. For the best Greek Ode in imitation of Sappho. 2. For the best Latin Ode in imitation of Horace. 3. For the best Greek and Latin Epigrams, the former after the

manner of the *Anthologia*, the latter after the model of *Martial*.]

The subjects for the present year are:—

1. *For the Greek Ode.*
Sanctius his animal . . .
Deerat adhuc, et quod dominari in
cætera posset:—
Natus Homo est—

2. *For the Latin Ode.*
Iphigenia in Aulide.

3. *For the Epigrams.*
Παθήματα, μαθήματα.

N.B.—These exercises are to be sent in on or before April 30, 1827. The Greek Ode is not to exceed twenty, and the Latin Ode twenty-five stanzas.

PORSON UNIVERSITY PRIZE.

[The Dividends of £400 Navy 5 per cent. to be expended in the purchase of Greek Books, to be given to an Undergraduate yearly, at the commencement, as a Prize for Greek Verses.]

The subject for the present year is,
As YOU LIKE IT, Act II. Scene 3.
Beginning . . . But do not so: I have, &c.
And ending . . . — with truth and loyalty.

N.B.—The metre to be Tragicum Iambicum Trimetrum Acatalecticum. These exercises are to be accentuated and accompanied by a literal Latin prose version, and are to be sent in on or before the 30th of April, 1827.

NORRISIAN PRIZE.

[A prize of £12, to the Author of the best Prose Essay on a Sacred Subject.]

Subject for the ensuing year is,
The Proofs of a General Judgment to come, and the advantages of the knowledge revealed to mankind concerning it.

N.B.—All the above exercises are to be sent in to the Vice-Chancellor privately; each is to have some motto prefixed, and to be accompanied by a paper sealed up, with the same motto on the outside; which paper is to enclose another, folded up, having the candidate's name and college written within. The papers containing the names of those candidates who may not succeed, will be destroyed unopened. No prize will be given to any exercise which is written, wholly or in part, (or of which the title, motto, superscription, address, &c. are written,) in the handwriting of the candidate. Any candidate is at liberty to send in his exercise printed or lithographed. No prize will be given to any candidate who has not, at the time of sending in the exercises, resided one term at the least.

The Seatonian Prize has not been adjudged.

TERMS for 1827.

| | begins. | ends. | div. |
|-----------|----------|---------|-------------|
| Lent Term | Jan. 13 | April 6 | Feb. 21, m. |
| Easter | April 25 | July 6 | May 31, n. |
| Michael. | Oct. 10 | Dec. 16 | Nov. 12, m. |

The commencement will be July 3.

ST. DAVID'S COLLEGE, CARDIGANSHIRE.

St. David's College, which was founded in 1822, by the present Bishop of Salisbury, at Llampeter in Cardiganshire, for the benefit of the clergy in South Wales, the poverty of whose preferment precludes them from the advantages of an University education, is to be opened by the Bishop of St. David's in the ensuing February, when it will be incorporated by Royal Charter. The style of the building is Gothic; and the beauty of its design reflects great honour on the architect, Mr. Cockerell. It is calculated to accommodate about seventy students; and the Bishop of St. David's intends to admit persons from any part of the kingdom, provided they be members of the

NO. I.—JAN. 1827.

Church of England. The annual expense will, it is expected, be within £55. A valuable collection of books has been presented to it by the Bishop of Salisbury, to which many of the Colleges and Members of the University of Oxford have liberally contributed. A grace has also passed the Senate of the University of Cambridge, to give to it a copy of all books that have been printed at its expense or are now in the press. The Rev. Llewellyn Lewellin, M.A. of Jesus College, Oxford, has been appointed Principal; and the Rev. Alfred Ollivant, M.A. Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, Vice-Principal and Senior Tutor.

T

UNIVERSITY OF DUBLIN.

DEGREES CONFERRED FROM JANUARY TO DECEMBER, INCLUSIVE.

February 4.

Present the Provost and all the senior Fellows. The grace of the house for the Degree of A.B. was granted to one Filius Nobilis (The Hon. Harvey De Montmorency), four Fellow Commoners, one hundred and sixty-two Pensioners, and two Sizars.

May 20.

The Provost informed the Board, that he had, according to their request, communicated to the Lord Chancellor the resolution which had been agreed to unanimously at a former meeting, of conferring an Honorary Degree of LL.D. on the Right Honourable Thomas Lord Manners, Lord High Chancellor of Ireland, in testimony of the high sense which this Board entertain of his eminent legal attainments, and of the talents, integrity, and courtesy with which he has uniformly discharged the duties of his distinguished and important station. His Lordship's answer to this communication, addressed to the Provost, was laid before the Board on the same day. It was expressed as follows:

Dublin, May 20, 1826.

DEAR SIR,

I have this instant received your communication of the honour conferred on me by the Provost and Fellows of Trinity College, Dublin, at a Board held this day, and which alone must be considered by me as a most flattering and distinguished mark of their approbation; but accompanied as it is by the expressions contained in the resolution, and proceeding from so learned and highly respectable a body, I am at a loss sufficiently to express my gratitude, and the importance I attach to so valuable a testimony to my conduct.

I must beg of you to return my warm and sincere thanks to the members of the Board, and to accept the same from,

My Dear Sir,

Very sincerely yours,
(Signed) MANNERS.

To the Reverend
the Provost of T.C.D.

DOCTOR IN DIVINITY.

July 8.

Rev. William Phelan.

Mathew Esmonde White.
George Rumley.
William Connor.
Howard Cooke.

BACHELORS AND DOCTORS IN DIVINITY.

July 8.

Rev. Stewart Segar Trench.
Rev. Dionysius Lardner.
Rev. William Bailey.
Rev. John Seymour.
Lees Gifford.
George Grierson.

BACHELORS IN MEDICINE.

July 8.

Edward Stack.
John Davidson M'Cready.
Henry Coulson Beauchamp.
James Donovan.
Claudius Henry Auchinleck.
William Richard Vincent Lane.
William Cummins.
Robert Plunket.

MASTERS OF ARTS AND BACHELORS IN MEDICINE.

July 8.

John Elliott.
Percival Hunt.
Shewbridge Connor.
William Corbett.
Thomas Fox.

MASTERS OF ARTS.

July 8.

Rev. William Le Poer Trench.
Rev. William Burkitt Moorehead.
Rev. Thomas Jervis White.
Rev. Mortimer O'Sullivan (without fees).

Rev. James Stewart Blacker.
 Rev. John Darley, J.F.T.C.D.
 Rev. Edward Herbert.
 Rev. William Morris Holt Williams.
 Rev. Travers Jones.
 Rev. Robert Hume.
 John Clendinning.
 Hilary Frederick L'Estrange.
 John Brown.
 Edward Grogan.
 Alexander Reade.
 William Brereton.
 George Harkness.
 Alexander Donovan.
 John Creery Ferguson.

Also the Degree of A.B. to eighty-three candidates, of whom forty-seven were Fellow Commoners, thirty-five Pensioners, and one Sizar.

MISCELLANEOUS UNIVERSITY INTELLIGENCE.

January 28.

It was on this day ordered by the Board, that the matriculation of students just admitted shall be on the two days of the examination of junior freshmen, and the day following; and that those who do not so matriculate shall not be allowed their examinations.

April 29.

Present all the Members of the Board. There being a Bill in progress in the House of Commons, by which "any Clergyman, who shall have to the amount of three hundred pounds per annum in the church, shall be refused a faculty to enable him to hold another living in addition;" and it being considered that a regulation of this kind might hereafter interfere with arrangements whereby small College livings can now be rendered available, the Board have requested that the Provost shall go and confer with the Right Hon. the Attorney General for Ireland, (the representative of the University in Parliament,) on this subject.

May 22.

The following were elected into the vacant Scholarships: viz.

John Meade. Thomas Byrne.
 Stephen Browne. Patrick Cullinan.
 Wm. Short Thymne. Walter Delamere.
 These were all admitted in the usual form on the following morning.

July 1.

The following Students (who had been candidates for Scholarships,) were elected into exhibitions: viz.

| | |
|----------|------------|
| Murphy. | M'Donagh. |
| Sharkey. | Lloyd, 1. |
| Brady. | Beatty, J. |

July 3.

At the Entrance Examination, holden on this day, ninety-seven candidates, out of one hundred and three, were admitted.

July 7.

This being the regular day for holding the Summer Commencements, but the appointment of a new Vice Chancellor, in place of the late Lord Downes, not having yet arrived, there was a meeting in the Theatre, of the Provost, Fellows, Masters, and Professors, and of the several candidates for Degrees; and the Provost having called on the Proctors to read over the names of the candidates for Degrees in both Senior and Junior Commencements, each candidate signed his name to an engagement as follows:—

"We, the undersigned, do hereby promise that we will attend at some future Commencement, to take the oaths required by law, and to be admitted to the Degrees for which the Grace of the House has been granted to us." (Signed by the several candidates for Degrees.)

July 10.

A meeting of the Provost, Fellows, and Scholars, was holden in the Theatre, for the purpose of electing a Burgess for the University, when the Right Honourable WILLIAM CONYNNGHAM PLUNKET, His Majesty's Attorney-General for Ireland, was proposed by DR. PHIPPS, S.F.T.C.D., seconded by Sir O'Donoghue, senior scholar of the House, and unanimously elected.

October 16.

At the Entrance Examination, holden on this day, one hundred and twenty-eight, out of one hundred and thirty-nine candidates were admitted.

November 6.

At the Entrance Examination, holden on this day, of one hundred and thirty-four persons who presented themselves for

admission, one hundred and twenty-four were afterwards entered on the books.

November 20.

The Officers for the ensuing year were elected at a meeting of the Board. The arrangements of the preceding year were retained, with the following exceptions :

Dr. Lloyd was appointed one of the Preachers, in the room of Mr. Griffin, elected to serve as Junior Dean ; and Mr. Martin, Junior Proctor.

The usual oaths were administered the following morning at a Meeting of the Provost and Fellows, holden for that purpose in the chapel.

November 25.

The Annual Visitation was holden on this day, The Right Honourable the Lord Chancellor being present as Vice-Chancellor in the place of the late Lord Chief Justice, and His Grace the Archbishop of Dublin, as Visitor of the University.

The Provost, Fellows, and Scholars of the University attended, in pursuance of the summons usual on this occasion ; and the several heads of intelligence, respecting the state of learning and number of students in the University, were submitted by the former to their Lordships, who were pleased to express themselves highly gratified by the appearance which the returns exhibited.

PRIZES.

VICE-CHANCELLOR'S PRIZES.

[For the Spring Commencements.]

Adjudged to

| | |
|------------|----------|
| Sir Taylor | } Prose. |
| Sir Conan | |
| Kelly. | } |
| Phayre. | |
| Gamble. | |
| O'Beirne. | |

The subjects were :—

GRADUATE'S PRIZE.

Mihi autem orationis differentiam fecisse et dicentium et audientium nature videntur.

UNDERGRADUATE'S PRIZE.

Terræ motum nemo pugnantium ad Trasimenum lacum sentit.

[Entrance Examination.]

July 3.

| | |
|-----------------|-------------|
| Sir Greené. | Sir Taylor. |
| Sir O'Donoghue. | Sir Perdu |
| Sir O'Brien. | Kelly. |

The subjects were :—

GRADUATE'S PRIZE.

In Greek, Latin, or English Prose,—

The attempt of Julian to rebuild the temple of Jerusalem.

UNDERGRADUATE'S PRIZE.

In Greek, Latin, or English Verse,—

Cometa naufragium.

GOLD MEDALS

[For exemplary attendance on Greek Lectures.]

Adjudged to

Sir Callaghan. Sir Grier.

HEBREW PREMIUMS.

[Primate Newcome's foundation.]

Adjudged to

March 18.

| | |
|--------------|----------------|
| Sir Conneys. | Sir Hamilton. |
| Sir Grier. | Sir Mercier. |
| Sir Irwin. | Sir Singleton. |
| Sir Archer. | |

July 4.

| | |
|-------------|-----------|
| Miller. | Campbell. |
| Mauleverer. | Meara. |
| Hunt. | O'Brien. |
| Turnley. | Bodkin. |
| Frayre. | Miller. |
| Knox. | Johnston. |

October 17.

| | |
|-----------|-------------|
| Odell. | M'Causland. |
| Waters. | Bunbury. |
| Drury. | Norris. |
| Meredith. | Quinan. |
| Wright. | Creery. |
| Norman. | Frew. |

November 7.

| | |
|--------|-----------|
| Walsh. | Downing. |
| Ball. | Roche. |
| Lloyd. | Bradshaw. |
| Boyd. | |

Premiums on the same foundation were granted to the following Bachelors of Arts, July 8:—

| | |
|------------|----------|
| Taylor. | Archer. |
| Todd. | Disney. |
| Ryal, sen. | Dowdall. |
| Hamilton. | |

| | |
|---------------|-------------|
| Bagott, 2. | } Science. |
| Prior. | |
| Mease. | |
| Hemmings. | } Classics. |
| O'Neil, S. | |
| Loneragan, 1. | |

GOLD MEDALS,
*"Propter insignes progressus in Artibus,
et in Literis Humanioribus,"*

Adjudged to

| | |
|-------------|-----------|
| Mr. Berry. | Science. |
| Mr. Goolde, | Classics. |

The several prizes on DR. DOWNES'S foundation, were conferred,

July 8.

For reading the Liturgy, on
 Sir Mercier. Sir Whiteside.
 Sir O'Beirne. Sir Gregg.
 Sir Armstrong.

For Composition, on
 Sir Morgan. Sir Gregg.
 Sir Grier. Sir Taylor.

For Extempore Speaking, on
 Sir Taylor. Sir Gregg.

The subjects proposed, were: for composition,—“Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.” Matth. xxviii. 19.

For Extempore Speaking,—“Search the Scriptures.” John, v. 39.

On the same day the Mathematical Premiums, on BISHOP LAW'S foundation, were adjudged to

Sir Wilson.

MICHAELMAS QUARTERLY EXAMINATIONS.

Commenced October 20.

The candidates for the medal in *Artibus* were examined on the first two days; and for that in *Literis Humanioribus*, on the third and fourth. They were adjudged to the following:—

| | |
|----------------|-----------|
| M'Causland, 2. | Science. |
| Fitzgerald, 2. | Classics. |

The remaining candidates were,

| | |
|-----------------|------------|
| Bernard, 1. | } Science. |
| Donnelly. | |
| Roche, 1. | |
| Fitz Gerald, 3. | |
| Fitz Gerald, 1. | |
| Shice. | |

CERTIFICATES for general answering were at the same time granted to the following:—

| | |
|---------------|---------------|
| Mr. Moore, 2. | Griffith, 4. |
| Tottenham. | Low. |
| Evans. | Loneragan, 2. |
| Lloyd, 1. | Delamare. |
| Hamilton, 2. | |

PREMIUMS to the following:—

| | |
|-----------|--------------|
| Blake, 1. | Thillaly, S. |
| Busteed. | Cullinan, J. |
| Stack, S. | Gosselin, S. |

CERTIFICATES, *propter insignes progressus in Artibus*, to the following:—

| | |
|------------|-------------|
| Mr. Thyle. | Mr. Haig. |
| Henderson, | Kearney, S. |
| J. 1. | Hamblin. |
| Sadler, 3. | Longfield. |
| Bleasby. | Blake, 5. |
| M'Cullagh. | Saville. |

PREMIUMS to the following:—

| | |
|----------------|----------------|
| Mr. Fortescue. | Mr. Collis, S. |
| Blake, 2. | Hardy. |
| Griffith, 5. | Mockler, J. |
| Lynch, 3. | Stack, J. |
| Ringwood. | Waugh. |
| Cosby, S. | Culligan. |

CERTIFICATES, *propter insignes progressus in Literis Humanioribus*, were adjudged at the same time to the following:—

| | |
|---------------|------------|
| Mr. Pomeroy. | Mr. O'Hea. |
| Henderson, J. | Hardy. |
| Ormsby, 3. | Graydon. |
| Power, 2. | Leslie. |
| Mc. Cullagh. | Waugh. |
| Murphy. | Saville. |

PREMIUMS to the following:

| | |
|--------------|-----------------|
| Mr. Ormsby. | Mr. Williamson. |
| Griffith, 5. | Hobart, J. |
| Nolan, J. | Blake, 5. |
| Whiteside. | Atkins, 3. |
| Cowen, J. | M'Neece. |
| O'Grady. | |

ANNUAL DIVINITY EXAMINATIONS.

Holden, November 22, and the following day, by the Very Reverend the Dean of Ardagh, Professor of Divinity, and the Rev. Dr. Wall, S.F.T.C.D. Archbishop King's Lecturer in Divinity.

The premiums were adjudged to the following:—

Sir Shaw.

Sir Nixon.

Extra premiums were granted by the Board, in consideration of the excellent answering displayed, to the following:—

Sir Mercier.

Sir Magrath.

Sir Ashe, S.

Sir Prior.

NOTICES RESPECTING COURSES,
PRIZES, &c.

The First Three Books of Xenophon's *Cyropædia*, and of Livy, were added to the usual Course read by Candidates for entrance, by order of the Board. This Order to become effective from the first Monday in January, 1827, inclusive.

The Classical and Science Medal Courses were also revised during the past year. The following received the sanction of the Board:—

In Literis Humanioribus:—*Æschyli Agamemnon*, substituted for the *Septem contra Thebas*, which had hitherto been read.

Longinus de Sublimitate.

Aristotelis *Rhetorica*.

Taciti *Annales*.

Cicero de *Oratore*.

Horatii *Epistola ad Pisones*.

In Artibus:—Butler's *Analogy of Religion*, natural and revealed, to the Constitution and Course of Nature.

Trigonometry, Plane and Spherical.

Analytical Geometry, with two Co-ordinates generally, and with three as far as the equation of a tangent plane to a curved surface.

The Elements of the Differential Calculus, generally, and the Integral, as far as is required for the other parts of the Course.

The Statics of an Invariable System, generally, and those of a Variable, as applied to the Equilibrium of Structures,

to the Funicular Polygon, and the Common Catenary.

The Dynamics of a material point in Vacuo, both free and constrained. The Theory of Central Forces, the force being single and the centre fixed.

The Dynamics of an Invariable System, moveable about a fixed axis in vacuo. Nature and investigation of the principal Axes, and Theory of the Compound Pendulum.

The Formulæ for the values of the more important moving and resisting forces which are engaged in Terrestrial Mechanics.

The principal of Virtual Velocities; and D'Alembert's Mechanical Principle, with its application to the Mechanic Powers.

Hydrostatics.

The Elements of Optics.

Plane Astronomy.

Physical Astronomy, as far as the Problem of the Two Bodies; and the discussion of Kepler's Laws as given in Newton's *Principia*, sections 2 and 3, 7, and the earlier propositions of the 11th section, book 1, and as the same are given in chap. i. book 2, of Laplace's *Mécanique Céleste*.

Though the Examination, *In Artibus* will be restricted by Subjects and not by Authors, yet the following works relating, some entirely, others almost entirely, to the prescribed subjects, are recommended to the particular attention of the candidates.

Woodhouse's *Trigonometry*.

Lloyd's *Analytical Geometry*.

Lardner's *Algebraic Geometry*.

Lacroix's *Théorie des Lignes Courbes*, as given in the Fourth Chapter of the First Volume of his large Work.

Lardner's *Differential and Integral Calculus*.

Poisson's *Traité de Mécanique*.

Venturoli's *Mechanics*, translated by Creswell, 2 parts.

Robinson's *Mechanics*.

Lardner on *Central Forces*.

Coddington's *Optics*.

Brinkley's *Astronomy*.

Woodhouse's *Plane Astronomy*, second Edition.

VICE-CHANCELLOR'S PRIZES.

The Subjects for the next commencements are,

GRADUATE'S PRIZE.

In Greek, Latin, or English Prose or Verse.

Saul consulens Pythonissam in Endor.

UNDERGRADUATE'S PRIZE.

In Greek, Latin, or English Verse,

Bhurlpore.

The Compositions are to be sent under fictitious signatures to the Senior Lecturer, on or before the 19th of January, 1827.

The following Table presents a view of the State of the University as to Members on the 24th Nov. 1826.

| | Masters. | Fellow Commo- ners. | Scholars. | Pensioners. | Sizars. | Total. |
|---------------------------|----------|------------------------|-----------|-------------|---------|--------|
| Bachelors | 7 | 43 | 46 | 74 | 16 | 186 |
| Candidate Bachelors . . . | | | 15 | 198 | 4 | 217 |
| Senior Sophisters | | 53 | 6 | 200 | 3 | 262 |
| Junior Sophisters | | 63 | 3 | 240 | 8 | 314 |
| Senior Freshmen | | 58 | | 413 | 10 | 481 |
| Junior Freshmen | | 52 | | 327 | 9 | 388 |
| Total | 7 | 269 | 70 | 1452 | 50 | 1848 |

QUARTERLY LIST

OF

FOREIGN THEOLOGICAL PUBLICATIONS.

Coquerel, Pasteur à Amsterdam, Biographie Sacrée. Vols. 1, 2, 3. 8vo. 1l. 11s. 6d. To be completed in 4 vols.

L'Ami du Bien, Journal consacré à la Morale Chrétienne, et aux progrès des Lettres, des Sciences, et des Arts. 1r cahier. Marseille.

James, Pasteur à Breda, Discours sur la corruption profonde, totale et universelle, du genre humain, et sur l'unique moyen par lequel l'homme pécheur peut-être justifié devant Dieu, &c. 8vo. 1s. 6d.

Liturgie en usage dans les Eglises Réformées de France. 1 vol. in 4to. 7s. 6d.

Histoire de l'Ancienne Principauté de Sedan, jusqu'à la fin du 18e Siècle; par J. Peyran, Pasteur de l'Eglise Reformée de cette ville. 2 vols. 8vo. 18s.

Mernadier, Pasteur à Vallon, Essai sur l'Influence des Sociétés Bibliques. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Histoire de la Saint Barthélemy, d'après les Chroniques, Mémoires, et MSS. du 16e Siècle. 8vo. 10s. 6d.

Précis Historique des Faits qui ont eu lieu lors de la Conversion de S. A. le Prince de Salm, de la Religion Catholique Romaine au Culte Chrétien Evangélique de la Confession de Augsbourg, le 17 Mai, 1826, suivi des motifs de ce Changement de Communion; publié par ordre et aux frais du Prince. 8vo. 2s.

Vinet, Mémoire en faveur de la Liberté des Cultes. Ouvrage qui a obtenu le prix dans le concours ouvert par la Société de la Morale Chrétienne, le 13 Avril, 1826. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Cellerier, (Fils,) De l'Origine Authentique et Divine de l'Ancien Testament. 12mo. Geneve. 4s. 6d.

Notice sur Jean-Frederic Oberlin, Pasteur à Waldbach, au Ban-de-la-Roche, mort le 1er Juin, 1826, avec portrait. 8vo. 2s.

Bouvet de Cressé, Résumé de l'Histoire des Papes. 18mo. 4s. 6d.

Résumé de la doctrine des Jesuites, ou Extraits des assertions dangereuses et pernicieuses soutenues par les Jesuites dans leurs ouvrages dogmatiques; recueillies et imprimées par ordre du Parlement en 1762. 18mo. 4s. 6d.

Résumé de l'histoire des guerres de religion en France, par Saint-Maurice. 18mo. 3s. 6d.

Bibliothèque Choisie des Pères d'Eglise Grecque et Latine, par Guillon. Tom. XV. et XVI. 8vo. 1l. 1s.

Marcet de la Roche-Arnaud, Les Jesuites modernes, pour faire suite au Mémoire de M. de Montlosier. 8vo. 7s.

FRENCH PERIODICALS.

| <i>Those marked thus † are Catholic.</i> | | Annual |
|---|---------|---------------|
| | | Subscription. |
| | | £ s. d. |
| † L'Ami de la Religion et du Roi; Journal ecclesiastique, politique et littéraire. 8vo. <i>Published weekly.</i> | - - - - | 2 8 0 |
| Ami de la Jeunesse. 32mo. <i>Monthly.</i> | - - - - | 0 3 0 |
| Archives du Christianisme au XIXe. Siècle. 8vo. <i>Monthly.</i> | - - - - | 0 9 0 |
| Bulletin de la Société Biblique Protestante de Paris. 8vo. <i>Monthly.</i> | - - - - | 0 5 0 |
| † La France Chrétienne, Journal religieux, politique et littéraire. 8vo. <i>weekly.</i> | - - - - | 4 10 0 |
| Journal de la Société de la Morale Chrétienne. 8vo. <i>Monthly.</i> | - - - - | 1 0 0 |
| — des Missions Evangéliques. 8vo. <i>Monthly.</i> | - - - - | 0 12 0 |
| † Mémorial Catholique. 8vo. <i>Monthly.</i> | - - - - | 1 4 0 |
| Revue Protestante (à laquelle sont réunis les Mélanges de Religion publiés à Nismes par le Pasteur Vincent). 8vo. <i>Monthly.</i> | - - - - | 0 15 0 |

Alber, D. I. Nep., Interpretatio sacræ scripturæ per omnes veteris et novi testamenti libros. XVI. Tomi. 8maj. 8l. 8s. Pesthini 1801—4.

— — Institutiones hermeneuticæ scripturæ sacræ veteris et novi testamenti. Juxta systema theologicæ noviss. præscriptum, concinn. sec. edidit. VI. Tomi. 8maj. — Ibidem, 1817, 18. 3l. 13s. 6d.

Ammon, D. C. Fr. v., Handbuch der christl. Sittenlehre. 2r Bd. 1ste Abthl. gr. 8. 7s. Vol. I, published in 1823, is 10s.

Archiv, kirchenhistorisches, von K. F. Stæudlin, H. G. Tzschirner und J. S. Vater, fuer 1826. 4 Hefte. 8. Halle. 10s.

Augusti, D. J. C. M., Denkwuerdigkeiten aus der christlichen Archæologie; mit beständ Ruecksicht auf die gegenwärt. Beduerfnisse der christl. Kirche. 8r Bd. — Auch u. d. Titel: Die heiligen Handlungen der Christen. 5r Bd. Archæologie des Abendmahls. gr. 8. Leipzig. 10s. Vols. I. to VII., published from 1817 to 1825, are 3l. 3s.

Beck, D. Fr. A. Deutsche Synopsis der drei ersten Evangelisten. Nach der griechischen Synopsis de Wette's, u. Luecke's bearb. Ein Handbuch fuer Lehrer in Schullehrer-Seminarien u. niedern Classen gelehrter Schulen, so wie f. jeden denkenden Christen. gr. 8. Berl. 4s. 6d.





